

SCRIPTURE MEANING

2,

THE

SCRIPTURE MEANING

OF

Aleim and Berith.

[Price a.s. 6d.]

SCRI^TUR^E MEANING

Alisim Bony B'stirri.



THE BOSTON LIBRARY

THE
SCRIPTURE MEANING
O F *L.*
ALEIM and *BERITH*,

Justified against the
EXCEPTIONS of Dr. Sharp

In his two
DISSERTATIONS

Concerning
ELOHIM and *BERITH*.

By *JULIUS BATE*, M. A.

Zeal to promote the Common Good, whether it be by devising any thing ourselves, or revising that which hath been laboured by others, deserveth certainly much Respect and Esteem, but yet findeth but cold Entertainment in the World. It is welcomed with Suspicion instead of Love, and with Emulation instead of Thanks: And if there be any Hole left for Cavil to enter, (and Cavil, if it do not find a Hole, will make one) it is sure to be misconstrued, and in danger to be condemned. — Was there ever any Thing projected, that favoured any way of *Newness* or *renewing*, but the same endured many a Storm of Gain-saying or Opposition.

The Translators (of our Bible) to the Readers.

L O N D O N:

Printed for E. WITHERS, at the Seven-Stars, near the
Temple-Gate, Fleet-Street. 1751.

THE
SCRIPTURE MEANING

3-0

ALFRED AND BERTHA

ed: *Finis: bonifacij*

Exceptions of Dr. Spalding

disorderly state of affairs.

2011-0000

ELOHIM SAY BETH



modest

• 271 • *Был-был волшебник*

THE DOCTOR'S DISCUSSION ON THE DOGMA OF THE DIVINE

THE DOCTOR'S DISCUSSION ON THE DOGMA OF THE DIVINE

THE

SCRIPTURE MEANING

OF

Aleim and Berith, &c.

THE learned Dr. Sharp, the Archdeacon of *Northumberland*, and Prebendary of *Durham*, has done the *H—ns* the Favour long-looked and long-wished for, of publishing his *Notions in relation to Elohim* [as he is pleased to write *Aleim*] and *Berith*, in two judicious and candid *Dissertations*, to which neither Time nor Care have been wanting; any more than are Abilities in the Author or Assistance from his Friends; so that we may reasonably expect to meet here, with every Objection that would bear urging against us, every Consideration that is of any Weight, in the Support of his own, or that tends to the Disadvantage of our Construction, of these important Words.

The Doctor is pleased to apologise for so long delaying the Publication, and give his Reasons for doing it at last.

" I have at length signed, and now deliver in
" my Plea,

Says this able Advocate,

" In behalf of the two Words, whose Cause I
" have undertaken; to prevent, if I may, the
" passing a definitive Sentence, that they are un-
" contestable, under Mr. H—n's Exposition of
" of them." *Preface*, p. 21.

The Dispute is about the Family the Doctor's Clients belong to ; of what Country they are, what Language they spoke, and whether they be of any Use and Importance to others ; the Doctor contends that they are a Couple of unmeaning Babblers, whose Relations disown them. We have put in a Claim in their behalf, and demand the Honour due to them, as Descendants of an antient and honourable Family, of which they are themselves the first and chief Branches. And this we would prove, from the high Posts of Honour formerly assigned them ; the Rank of Life they held ; and the great Deference all Nations paid them, who ever placed them at the Head both of their Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs ; at a Time when none, but those of this Family were employed, especially in the Affairs of Religion. The great and important Truths always in their Mouths, will sufficiently compensate for the Trouble we may be at in making what they say to be clear and intelligible to others. It is pretended that the antient Records of their Family are lost ; or that they are not registered with the Family we say they belong to. We would therefore prove their Lineage and Country by their Features, Make, Proportion, and extreme Likeness to a Family, which has had better luck with their Register, and whom they resemble so much, that when you meet them separately, it is impossible to know them asunder. This Cause has been long in Court, and Advocates of different Talents from the Doctor's have, to the utmost of their Power, laboured the Point ; not without such a Mixture of Heat and ill Language, as is offensive to good Manners, and which the Counsel for the Plaintiffs, as Dr. *Sharp* himself is so complaisant as to acknowledge, did not deserve.

As these Gentlemen have not conducted themselves with that Decency, Temper, and Sobriety,

the

the Doctor has endeavoured to do, and hopes he has done, so neither have they been so happy in their Opposition, or had that Success to be expected from his *more sober, studied, improved, more candid, better dressed Objections, and reinforced weightier Arguments*^a; you have here, kind Reader, all that is best in the former Pleadings in this Cause: The stale Meat that is served up again, as *some* there is, is *dressed over again, and more agreeably than before*. The same Arguments come reinforced with *some additional Weight*; it being fair to introduce again such Arguments as have not been as yet replied to. And no doubt such Arguments will be pointed out, in the Course of the Doctor's Pleading, as have not been replied to; and we may certainly expect that what is said to be *not satisfactorily answered*, will be shewn to be so, when the *stale Objection comes to be served up again*.^b

The Doctor seems to acknowledge we have hitherto had the better of the Dispute.

" In the printed Controversy that arose from " Mr. C——'s Sermon, the Merits of the Question " were not, in my Opinion, sufficiently attended to, " or fully reached," *Preface, p. 15.*

By our Opponents, I apprehend, he means: We not being obliged to attend to, what they did not call us to attend to; or reach at what was not produced in Court. Their ill Success and ill Conduct then required a more able and judicious Advocate to undertake the Cause, and prevent the *definitive Sentence* passing against them; and such the Doctor has most undoubtedly shewn himself, but I hope the Success will not quite answer his Expectations.

The Doctor has been pleased to assign another Reason that induced him to take this ~~Trouble~~ upon him, *viz. The Request of the Editors of Mr. H——n's Works*; I do therefore return my sincere

^a See *Preface, passim.*

^b *Preface, p. 22, 3.*

Acknowledgments and Thanks for so particular a Favour and Regard shewn to our Request, by a Person of Dr. Sharp's great Character in private Life; Rank in publick Life; and Esteem, for Abilities natural and acquired, among the Learned. And hope that what the Doctor has done,

“ May induce others to take more Words and Roots into Examination after the same manner.” An Attempt of this kind, soberly and candidly made, “ will tend *much* to the Discovery of the Truth, and give content to ingenuous Minds.”

It was this induced the Editors so earnestly to call for the Annotations of the Learned on Mr. H——n's Discoveries; and to endeavour to provoke them (pardon the Word, and the Fault) to sift and canvass them, that the World might see what Character they deserved; and that the Eyes of those, who will ever be guided by the Example of their Superiors, in Authority and Learning, might be turned upon them too. The Editors knew they should be Gainers by such an Examination. They would have the Advantage of being set right, if they were in the wrong; of being better informed in what might be pleaded against the Books they were recommending to the World, than their own private Studies, and more contracted Reading and Abilities could point out to them.

There is another Reason still, assigned by the Doctor for publishing these *Remarks*; and which might have been first taken notice of by me, as it is the first assigned by himself, and which seems to lay *uppermost* on his Mind; it is, *Want of proper D_eference to the Judgment of others; and the sanguine Expressions* Mr. H——n and his Followers propose their new Constructions in, *Preface*,

P. 14.

“ If what Mr. H——n has advanced in relation to such Words——had been proposed under the

“ Form

“ Form of *learned Conjectures*, or recommend-
 “ ed as useful Remarks, and the Reasons offer’d
 “ in support of them had been submitted with
 “ proper *Deference* to the Judgment of others; I
 “ should have been, for my part, very little disposed
 “ to take Exceptions against them.—But his Inter-
 “ pretations have been delivered to the World in
 “ another Style, and in another Character, as cer-
 “ tain Truths.”

I speak with all due *Deference* to the Judgment of the Gentleman I now direct my self to, and say, I should have thought that a Man’s being *thoroughly* convinced of the Truth of what he asserted, and accordingly telling the World so, had been no justifiable Exception to his Manner of writing. For my own part, I cannot look on *Conjectures* as *learned*, but as wanting of Learning. Nor *Remarks useful* on Matters of the utmost Consequence to Mankind, which are proposed, *only to try how far they may be carried*. There is a *Deference* due to the Word of God, which forbids not only all *trifling* with it; but, I should think, all *criticising* upon it, which we are not *fully convinced* is right in itself, and necessary, more or less, towards clearing its Meaning, and *ascertaining* what ourselves or others may have doubted about. It is not the *Words*, but the *Sense* of Scripture is our Guide: But we cannot come at its *Sense*, but through the *Words*; and if the *Words* have no settled, distinct Meaning, then farewell all Use of the *Bible*, but to multiply Debates, and confound those, who are so silly as to spend their Time in searching it. The Construction of the *Bible* had been long in the Hands of the *Apostates*; and Christians had made use of *their Eyes*, for the most part, in searching after the Divine Truths it contains. They made use of the Rules of Grammar and *Construction*, and followed the *Sense* of the *Words*

as laid down by the Enemies of all Righteousness. Mr. H——n comes to remove these Foundations, and sets the Apostates, and their Things, out in their proper Colours ; he is angry here, and had great Reason to be so ; so have other great Men been upon the same Occasion, both at Home and Abroad, who have expressed themselves with the like Indignation ; and give the *worst of Men*, and *worst of Things*, their proper Names. Some Christians appear more angry with him for it, than they would be thought to be ; and blame, in general Terms, a glorious Indignation. Let them defend the *Rabbins* by an Induction of Particulars, as he has condemned them.

But supposing that a sanguine Warmth of Temper, eager, and therefore confident, be blameworthy, irksome to an Adversary, and too much in a Hurry to stay to make proper Congees to every great Man it meets with ; yet some Allowance is to be made for Constitution. And he that is of a more cold, flegmatic Nature, less confident, rather distrustful and suspicioius, nay, even wavering and *sceptical*, which such an one calls Prudence, as the other does *bis Zeal* ; such an one may thank God, and not think it a Merit, that he is not like the Publican and Sinner, and has no more Reason to quarrel with me, merely for the natural Effects of my Constitution, than he has because the Complexions of our Faces may not be alike, or our Bodies of the same Bulk. Disputes carried on with Temper and Sobriety, contribute most, no doubt, to the Edification of the Parties themselves, as well as of their Readers. But that affected Civility, and mutual Compliments which sometimes pass between the Disputants, make it look as if they were seeking Honour from one another more than Truth. Again, a ceremonious Complaisance is an artful way of keeping Inferiors

at a Distance, and proceeds, generally speaking, from an Opinion that our Persons are too sacred to lay open to a familiar Access; and we keep up a sanctimonious Gravity in our Words and Gestures, as the Measure of the Reverence we would be approached with. One of this Stamp will think it unbecoming his Character to be seen to be angry; and an unpardonable Levity to break out into a Laugh. But this has not the least Tenderness of Temper in it; not a Spark of that Humility of Mind, and Meekness of Spirit, which is so reconciling to God and Man, and which it seems to affect; for a Laugh in the Sleeve has the same Contempt in it, though less Sincerity than the louder Laugh. And a *Grin*, or a *Sneer*, has at least as much Malice, if not so much of what we call Passion in it, as a less dissembled Anger, or rude Words. I hope what I say here will not give an Handle to an ill-natured Application, which I do not design: If none of these Apologies will screen Mr. H—n, or those of his Followers who are included in this *general Charge* before us, I must recommend them and myself to the Mercy of the Court, and proceed; after having just observed, that we have a Right to a little Mercy, since we are often *overcharged*, as in the next Words to these, which have occasioned my running out to this long Digression, *Pref. p. 14.*

“ — And this not without intermixing some
“ premature Reflections on the Weakness of Inter-
“ preters in general; and the Ignorance of our
“ Translators of the Bible in particular:”

For, I apprehend this is too hasty an Assertion, and an unguarded Reflection upon us, founded upon ill Fame, and which was industriously fomented by Mr. *Bedford* and some others at first, in order to raise a Prejudice against Mr. H—n and his Readers, or to justify that Prejudice, which had its Rise

from other Causes. We are so far from reflecting on Commentators in general, that we always say, there is no Commentator on Scripture, except your rabbinical and makometan Dreamers, but will pay for the Trouble of reading him. And as for the *Ignorance of our Translators in particular*, I am quite at a loss to know what the Doctor finds this Part of the Charge upon, or who were his Informers. As *Englishmen*, and writing to *Englishmen*, we cite our own *Translation*, which I have said (to clear myself) *is as good as any we have*, *Examiner Examined*, p. 34. This is one of the Pieces of *stale Meat* served up again, but not *new dressed*, or more agreeably than Mr. *Bedford* had done it, unless the Modern polite News-Paper Word, *premature*, adds a *Goût* to the old Dish. Mr. *B——d* says, *The frequent Complaints against all the Translations of the Bible, and particularly our own, &c.* Dr. *Sharp* calls it *premature Reflections on the Weakness of Interpreters in general, and the Ignorance of our Translators of the Bible in particular*. How far this is true, I appeal to the Writings themselves in general; Dr. *Sharp*, having not pointed out, as far as I remember, one Expression that justifies so invidious a Charge. Let the Reader see the handsome Apology Mr. *H——n* makes for *our Translators*, *Moses Print*. Part I. p. 112. and with what Reverence he speaks of the *Fathers*, *Gl. and Gr.* p. 253. where *inter al.* he says, “ These Men, “ though not inspired, deservedly will stand next “ in Dignity and Rank to those who were, nay, “ even to the Apostles.” I hope I have given no Offence hitherto, nor used any Expression, which a Person of Dr. *Sharp*’s Candour and Ingenuity will take disgust at. And I wish I may have less occasion as I go on to entrench upon that Respect I bear the Author of these two learned *Dissertations*.

I proceed now to the Work itself; to consider the Meaning of

אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֶיךָ

The Doctor remarks first, that

“ Whether a Word be a *Root* or *Derivative* is a Point frequently controverted; some making *Roots* of those Words, which others say are only derived from Roots.”

The Defender of Mr. H——n’s *Plan*, had said as much as this cited by the Doctor, p. 148. *The Roots are divided wrong in the Dictionaries*; but is answered, *Non sunt dicenda, quæ solâ negatione revertuntur*; and what he says to the modest *Apologist*, that more than a bare *say so* is necessary to overturn an Argument, is with great Propriety retorted upon him,—*He should have given us something besides his own say so*. I am here enabled to do it, and you have Dr. Sharp’s Word, besides that Author’s for it; for it is not an agreed Point, it seems, which are *Roots* and which *Derivatives*; some of them must divide or sort them wrong, if they are not agreed which are Roots.—But Mr. H——n, and some of his Followers, had given several remarkable Instances of it; among others, I have instanced in נָקַף and קָנַף. It is a controverted Point then often, whether a Word be a *Root* or *Derivative*, and so we are told, that

“ אֱלֹהִים is one of those Words, concerning which learned Men are divided in their Sentiments, whether it be a *Root* or *Derivative*.”

Now tho’ I must not say, because I cannot be positive in such an Assertion, that learned Men are not divided in their Sentiments, whether אֱלֹהִים be a *Root* or *Derivative*; yet I may say, this is the first learned Man, I ever knew say it; and I may be dubious whether any other ever said it. Whether אֱלֹהָה God, and אֱלֹהָה to execrate or denounce

nounce a *Bann*, be of the same Root, has formerly been a controverted Point, and for that Reason is so Now. But the Dispute is not whether אלהים be a *Root* or *Derivative*, for a *Plural* is derived from the *Singular*, but whether the Name of God be taken from a Word that signifies to *curse*; and had learned Men given a satisfactory Account how a Name of God, could be taken from, or given us under such an Idea, I believe, I may say, without being *sanguine*, it never would have been controverted whether אלה as a *Verb*, was of a different Root with אלה the Name of God. The *Verb* and *Noun* will always be supposed to have the same Meaning, or original Sense, unless some particular Reason appear to the contrary. And here let me ask what can it be supposed should induce *inspired* and infallible Writers, to write in this uncertain manner, so liable to deceive others, as to give so widely different and opposite Senses, to the same Words? Nay, to use the same Word, in a Sense in one Place, which some call Blasphemy to give it in others? Did not they know it must puzzle People; and that some would from thence take a Handle to make a Nose of Wax of the whole Word of God, that Uncertainty cannot be the Foundation of Faith? But I fear I am going too far, because Dr. Sharp all along represents it, as not an easy Matter, in so great a Variety of Opinions, to determine with any Certainty, whether any of them, is the true one: Nor of any great Consequence in such Disputes, which Opinion is admitted; and he recommends it as the Character of a modest and true Writer, to be indifferent about it, and sit down contented with our Ignorance; so I must suspect my own Opinion, but it looks to me, as if a very good Handle might thence be taken to set aside the *Scripture* as the Rule of Faith; for if there be no Rules of Grammar we can construe it by, or Methods

Methods to find out what the Words mean ; or if this be allowed only in some grand and capital Words, it may easily be extended farther, to insinuate, that we cannot be so far sure of the Meaning of the inspired Writers, as to be able to trust to their Directions, since we know not their Meaning in other Cases. If, for Instance, there be any real Doubt whether אלהּם אלהּם be *plural*, or why it is *plural* ; or, which is the same Thing, whether it have a *plural* Signification, though it be *plural* ; and though it consist of the same *radical* Letters, with another Word, it is yet really dubious, whether it be not highly improper to construe it in the same Sense ; if such Concessions are made to the *Infidel*, *Arian*, or *Socinian*, will it not afford them sufficient Ground to argue that Words so *vague* in Sense, and so *ungrammatically* put together, can never be able to *make us wise unto Salvation*, and therefore justify such a Latitude in interpreting them, as may make room for almost any Imagination whatever ? I hope, then I may modestly and truly say, that the Doubt and Distrust or Diffidence of the Sense of Scripture, recommended with that easy good Nature, and yet as a fixed Opinion of the Doctor's, that it is commendable, gives great Apprehension of Mischief to follow. It is an alarming Consideration, that Men so high in the Church, so eminent for their Learning, and who have spent so much Time in the Study of the sacred Books, should yet not be able to find, like *Noab's Dove*, a firm Footing for themselves, and should teach others to expect none in the original Record ; while the Raven finds plenty of Prey for himself.

The Dispute about *Roots* and *Derivatives*, I suppose, is, (as far as our present Controversy is concerned) whether the same Word, or Words of the same *radical* Letters, have always the same Meaning

ing, Idea, or Signification, so that the Word shall retain that Idea in every Deflection of it. If it had, and you can by the Context certainly fix the Meaning of the Word, in any of its *Deflections*, you construe it in all, *mutatis mutandis*, and it matters not whether you lay down the *Verb Pret* : or the *Noun*, or &c. as the *Root* ; or whether you have what is called the *Root*, from whence you begin to *deflect* : The Rules of Grammar must determine what Part of Speech a Word, e. g. אלהים or אלה is ; whether Noun or Verb, Singular, Plural, Masculine or Feminine, *Active* or *Passive*, and so on, tho' such *Distinctions* are not made in *Hebrew* or *English*, in the same Manner as they are in *Greek* or *Latin* ; but the same *Letters* shall be, all or any of them, and yet determinable by the help of the Context. Learned Men have been very much divided in this Dispute ; or rather divided in their Opinions, upon the Meaning and Etymologies of particular Words, in particular Places, which they could not construe agreeably to the Sense the same Words bore in the other Places. Mr. H——n thought he saw through the Labyrinth these Gentlemen had, as to such Particulars, involved themselves in ; namely, what is before mentioned, the Rules of Grammar and Construction laid down by the apostate Race, to whom the Book of God has been sealed, ever since they sealed the Prophecies with the Blood of the *Messiah* ; and which became sealed among them, from their diabolical Attempts to *seal* it from Christians. Mr. H——n has laid this open at large, and, by an Induction of many Particulars, shewn the Source of these Divisions among the Learned.

Here the learned Dr. Sharp differs from him, and thinks, that

“ If the Authority of the Rabbins and Lexicographers, be it more or less, be set aside, many

“ more Disputes will arise, than do already sub-
“ sist.”

But the Doctor has not been pleased to annex his Reasons; or shew us how those who are blind themselves can be proper Guides to others, and direct them to keep clear of the Ditch: Nor has he taken into consideration, the Exceptions, Mr. H——n has made to these—I must call them *Men*, because, if I call them Devils, I shall perhaps be said to be giving ill Language; as also to the *Arabians*. These Exceptions lay open in Court; and so able an Advocate as the Doctor must know so much of Law, as to know, they are not to be called into Court till those Exceptions be first canvassed. The Doctor seems to confess this, with regard to the *Rab-bins*; but does it with so ill a Grace, and looks so often back after them, that he no where makes so awkward a Figure as here.

“ Tho’ I am far from giving up all Authority of
“ Punctuation—yet, as Mr. C—— absolutely dis-
“ cards it, I will wave it,”

All, or none; we can make no Composition here. We have a Right to exclude both *Rabbin* and *Ma-bometan*, out of the Dispute, till they are cleared from the Disqualifications propounded. To mention but this one, their not being so old by many hundreds of Years, as the Facts they are produced in Evidence of, besides their Forgeries and Perjuries on Record. And I greatly suspect it must be Doctor H——t who persists in urging the Evidence of the *Arabs*, without the least Reply to what has been laid to their Charge; for you will not easily find another so steady and unmoveable in his own way; who, like *Homer’s* *Ass*, walks sturdily on, without altering his Pace, tho’ pelted from all Quarters. I must enter my *Caveat* against any the least Stress, that can be laid upon the *Talmud*, or his Brother the *Alcoran*.

They

They being wholly set aside, the first Objection to Mr. H——*n*, and others, in fetching אלה from אלה, is, that אלה is two Words, one of which has an *immutable* ה belonging to it, the other only a mutable one. Now, tho' you can see no more Difference betwixt ה and ה, than betwixt אלה and אלה; yet this is supported by the Authority of גבה and נה; of the first more particularly. Take the Argument in the Doctor's own Words:

“ There are certain Verbs, which end with an “ unchangeable ה, in which that Letter keeps its “ Place in all the Inflections of those Verbs, as “ consonantly and invariably, as any other of the “ unchangeable Letters do.—Now, אלהים being “ a Noun plural, the Preservation of the ה in it “ shews, that it must be derived from some perfect Verb, in which the ה never changes, or “ is lost, as גבה from גבאים; but אלה the Verb, “ whence Mr. C—— derives Elohim, cannot be “ the Root of it, because it has a changeable ה.”

True, if a Word cannot, or doth not, retain its ה in some Places, or on some Occasions, and yet drop it in others. But first, the Reader will remember, *we are to support the Distinction between certain Verbs, and their Derivatives, from the radical Letters alone.* I therefore put in a Plea in Behalf of certain Derivatives from גבה, who are excluded from the Honour of being of the same Stock, merely, as far as I can apprehend, because the Authors of Punctuation, would have it so. Under גב, which I do not dispute, as being another Root, we have גבות גבות and גבן גבי, גבות גבות גבות and גב, which if they are all, or any of them, *Derivatives of גבה*, the Argument, from the immutable ה, drops at once. Let us see, therefore, first, how that Matter stands. The two (supposed distinct) Roots are both construed to *the same Sense, High, lifted up, lofty*; and both applied to the very same

Things, as the Stature of Men, Eyes, Buildings, &c. The same Signification [as the Letters are so nearly the same] is one Mark of the Words being of the same *Root*. And tho' ה and ג, when radical, are often dropped, or changed ; yet, if it be by Rule, or you can shew Authority for it, Words so varied are deemed of the same Root ; as for Instance, אלהוּ אלֹהִים is deemed of the same Root with אלהִים, tho' the ה is, by Rule, changed into ת. *Lev. xiv. 9.* גְּבָתָ עַנְיָנוּ is translated *Supercilium* by one, and *Eminentia Oculorum* by another ; and the Part *high over the Eyes*, is a good Description of the Eyebrows. *Ezek. i. 18.* גְּבָתָם is, Chap. x. 12. writ גְּבָתָם. In the first, גְּבָתָם, *Pag. Dorsa eorum plena oculis* ; in the latter, & גְּבָתָם *dorsa eorum plena oculis*. Which is pretty plain Proof, that גְּבָתָם, in one Place, is גְּבָתָם of the others : Tho' in one, the ת, as in a Number of Instances, when *in regimine*, is changed into ת. So that the ה in גְּבָתָה doth not enjoy the Privilege of Immutability, as pretended. Now put the Case, that *Marius*, and others, had given the several Derivatives, I appeal to, under גְּבָתָה instead of גְּבָתָ, would not all the Force of the Doctor's Reasoning, from the immutable ת, have been entirely overthrown ; or, at least, so far weakened, as not to be able to bear the Weight laid upon it ? I have produced two Places, where גְּבָתָה and גְּבָתָ are the same ; and another Deflection or two of the Word might be brought, to shew that the ה is dropped, or changed, in גְּבָתָה, as well as other Words, tho' not so often ; but these two may suffice for my Purpose. I am almost confident, that Dr. *Sharp* is too fair an Adversary, to insist upon it, that גְּבָתָה, &c. belong to a different *Root*, from גְּבָתָה, merely because the Dictionaries place them so. It is very true, that גְּבָתָה retains the ה in more of its Deflections, than any other Word ; and in some, which no other Word does ; and

and I know of no other Instance, in the Bible, of a *Masculine Plural* preserving its **ה** besides it, except **אלֹהִים**; nor but one of a *Feminine Plural*. But if **גבָה** taken through, were not a Standard to *decline* or *deflect* **אלֹהָה** by; we can justify what we want, from Examples in other Words.

Let the Reader carefully observe the Force of the Doctor's Reasoning on this Head ; it will bear it ;—
“ *The Preservation of the ה in אלהים*, shews that it must be derived from some perfect Verb, in which the ה never changes, or is lost, as from נבהים from נבה. ” Suppose to be a perfect Verb, is the ה never preserved in the Deflections of what are called imperfect Verbs ? For if Instances of this kind can be produced, the Foundation of the above Observation, about an immutable ה, fails, and the Argument with it. There are many hundreds of Instances to be produced, of Words that retain the ה, tho' not in the *Masculine Plural*, yet in other Deflections, where the Preservation of it, would lead one to make the Inference the Doctor doth, and as fully justify it. e.g. מעשה—תלהו—עליה in regimine ; but the Reader may see numberless Instances of this kind, in running over the Words in *Marius* ; under נוה we meet with נוה, אנוּחוּ, נוה in regimine frequently, is, with Affixes, as נוהו bis Dwelling, several Times. So we see the ה preserved, whether as a Verb or Noun, in regimine, with Affixes, and without, as it is in נבה. Let us put the Argument into the Doctor's Form—“ נבהו—גבהו ”
“ גבוח—אנבה ” cum multis aliis, are Derivatives of the perfect Verb גבה, now the Preservation of the ה in עליה, a third Person masculine, and in נוה in regimine, in אלה, אלוה, a Part. passive, and in Instances without Number, of the like kind, shew they must be derived from perfect Verbs, as נבה is, and cannot be of the same Roots, with גוח, גוח, and אלה, אלה, which change, or “ drop,

“ drop, their **ה**.” They must all, or none have different Roots, for the Reason assigned by the Doctor; and if the **ה**, in other Words, be sometimes *preserved*, and at other Times flung away, why may not אלה change or drop its **ה** in some Places, tho’ not in others? And there is a plain Reason to be given why it should retain it in the *plural Masculine*; because otherwise it would have been unavoidably confounded with אלים, the *Plural of* אל: for אלה and אלים would have been so alike, that they could not have been known asunder. In the Instances produced above the **ה** looks as *immutable* as it does in אלהים, and I should be glad to know what Distinction can be laid down, which will take in the one and leave out the other.

The Doctor strengthens his Reasoning about אלה, by saying that “ *in all the Instances* where it occurs “ as a Verb *undoubtedly*, the **ה** is wanting.” p. 10.

This sounds more than it is; for there is *but one Instance* where אלה occurs as a Verb, *undoubtedly*; nay the Doctor himself even doubts of that. He produces the Places, p. 15. where אלה has been thought to occur as a Verb.

“ **אָלֵי** Joel i. 8. **אָלִית** Jud. xvii. 2. **אָלִי** Sam. xiv. 24. **אָלִי** 1 Kings viii. 31.” As to the first of these all are agreed, that אלה, is *lament*; but it may not be a *Verb*, but *Noun* here. אלה *there shall be Lamentation like that of a Virgin’s*, &c. the *Verb Substantive* is generally understood in Hebrew. It cannot be derived from אלה for a Reason given by the Doctor at the Bottom of this Page, that if it be from thence, it is *in the Imperative Mood and Feminine Gender*. I may add too, and in the *Singular Number*. The Prophet doth not address the Virgin, *lament*, *O Virgin*; but speaks to *all the Inhabitants of the Land*, whom he calls *Drunkards*; and bids them *weep and howl*, both *Verbs* in the *plural Number*; how should he address them in the *Feminine Gender*

and singular Number? This learned Gentleman seems to have thought it was the *Virgin* that was bid to lament. Why may not אָלֵי be formed like הָיָה and אָוֹן from the Sounds People make in lamenting, crying or sighing? אָלֵי in Sound comes very near our *alas!* and is the same Sense. אָ, ba! לְ me! put together, may be a Word for *Woe* or *Lamentation*; and the three Letters as much radical as in the two Words, for *Woe*, above. *Joel i. 5. Awake ye Drunkards and weep and bowl—a Nation is come up upon my Land—v. 8. There is Lamentation like a Virgin's girded with Sack-cloth.* This will make Grammar of it, which Dr. Sharp's Construction doth not. I have the Usage of הָיָה and אָוֹן, the natural Sounds on such Occasions; as well as the natural Sound of אָ ba! with the usual Addition of לְ me to it, to support my Construction. So אָלְלִי is regenerating this Sound, which we cannot help making in drawing up the Breath in a Fright or Concern. I shall set aside אָלָה then as a Verb from אָלָה, because *Nature*, *Grammar*, and the *Context* are on my Side.

Mr. H——n has remarked that אָלֵי being once thus writ, is no Proof that it comes from אָלָה; the Doctor replies, *Very true, for it may possibly come from some other Root, not now extant in the Hebrew Tongue.* Be it however remembered that this may be the Case of אָלָה and אָלָה as well as of אָלָה. A little too quick, I think because Mr. H——n doth not allow it has no Root in the Hebrew Tongue, but only that it is not proved that אָלָה is that Root; and the Doctor may now see that if אָלֵי have no Root in the Hebrew Tongue, it has a Root in *Nature*. But neither is the Doctor's Reply of any Service to him; for the Root of אָלָה can be no other than אָלָה, whether used or not in the Bible; there being no other three Letters you can possibly derive it from but these three: for there is no Rule, of him.

by which you can insert an **ה** as it is here. I have Dr. Sharp's own Authority for this, p. 9. **אללה** must be derived from some perfect Verb in which the **ה** never changes or is lost," therefore it must come from **אללה**.

The Note p. 15. says,

" Had Mr. H——n been skilled in *Arabic*; he probably might have told us, whence it, (אֱלֹהִים) came.—"

He might have told us whence the *Arabic* possibly came, for it might come from the *Hebrew*, but the *Hebrew* could not come from the *Arabic*. And I beg leave to tell the Doctor that Mr. H——n did understand *Arabic*; and has given so good an Account of it, that his *Arabian* Friend, did not dare to undertake the Defence of it, and should now according to all common Rules, forbear citing it in Evidence till he has done so.

The Doctor goes on,

" —I learn from those skilled in that Tongue, that **אל** or **אלל**, now lost in *Hebrew*, are yet extant, in the *Arabic*, *genuit, exclamavit p̄e dolore*, whence **אללִי**, **לִי**, **bei mibi**."

What is the meaning of *now lost* in *Hebrew*? *Hebrew* is not now a living Language. If it means *not now to be found in the Bible*; I say it is now to be found in *Hebrew* as much as ever it was; for supposing **אל** the Root; we have it in **אלִי** or **אלְיִ**; it is not lost because it has the *affix*, *Jod* to it, surely. But the Point about **אלִי** as a *Verb* derived from **אללה**, is entirely given up by fetching it from the *Arabic* **آل**; for if it come from the *Arabic* **آل**, it is not from the *Hebrew* **אללה**, and so the *Arabic* Note is in direct Contradiction to the Reasoning in the *Book* itself. This comes of borrowing Help from one who looks a different Way from us. The *Mabometan* doth not desire to have the *Bible* explained; he can dream of no Perfection but in the *Alcoran*; how was it possible for Prophets to write

so correct as a Brace of apostate *Jews*, an apostate *Christian*, and an illiterate *Arab*. But to proceed, p. 16.

“ The next Passage, and it is the only one in all the *Bible*, where אלהּ is used in *Kal Præt.* is אלהּ “ *Jud. xvii. 2.*”

Now I think that אלהּ here is *Hipbil*, because *Micah*'s Mother had no Right to denounce a Curse or *Bann*, but could according to the Law, in Case of a Robbery, go to the high Priest, and have it pronounced by him: and the *Jod*, in the third Order, as appears by the Grammars and Usage, is the Sign of *Hipbil*. This doth not much signify, but it cannot consistently with the Context be *ejulasti*, because it appears by the Context, that what is implied to have been done under the *Verb אלהּ* was the Cause that her Son restored the Money. *The Silver that was taken from thee, about which thou אלהּ, and also spake in my Ears, behold the Silver is with me, I took it.* This looks strongly, as if he had restored it to his Mother, because of her Concern expressed privately in *his Ears*, as to a Person she could vent her Grief to most naturally, and the אלהּ Curse publickly pronounced upon all who were Parties in the Theft or knew of it, and did not discover it; in which Case, it is presumed the Party that made a Discovery, tho' guilty, was to be pardoned. So she says to her Son, on his Confession, and restoring the Money, *blessed be thou my Son of *Jebovah*, and not cursed according to the Execration.* I hope the Doctor will not retract the Approbation he is pleased to give this Construction of אלהּ p. 17. “ *it appears most natural: Even one of Mr. H——n's Friends renders it by, thou execratedst, or adjuredst me.*” He does so, and if, he did not speak full enough there, will enlarge here, and shew that to execrate and adjure, were the same Thing, for I shall have Occasion presently to enquire into the strict Meaning of אלהּ,

אלה, because some seem to have a confused Idea of what was meant by it : at least not clearly to apprehend what an Oath or Adjuration was.

The next Instance, supposed to be, of the Word to be examined, is 1 Sam. xiv. 24. Saul, אלה adjured the People, p. 18.

The Doctor seems as ready to give up this as he was the last, as coming from another Root.

“ Pagninus, and some of the best Lexicographers cite this very Passage under the Root אלה.”

Marius, among others, does so ; and I am very inclinable to think they are in the right of it ; only I fancy, upon Examination, it will be found, that אלה is the Root, and not אלה, which may be derived from אלה, but not *vice versa*. Mr. C—— took the Word, in the Passage above, as our Translators had, it not having been contested by any body, and was in the right of it ; and the Doctor has a Right to object, and dispute it if he pleases ; and we must either give it up or defend it, and this is the Claim we make, a Liberty of contesting this or that Assertion of *any* Writer, but an inspired one ; and to object their Authority to us when we do so, is, I apprehend, abusing those many great Men who have wrote on the Scriptures, who had too much Sense to desire that Authority should pass for Argument. Their Judgements were better than ours, than mine, I am sure, and I am sorry for it. Their Labours we envy them ; their Memories we revere ; but their Authority, when set up as a Bugbear, we despise. It is fair to argue upon a generally allowed Construction of a Word, till that Construction is contested ; and then, the Reasons it is contested upon are to be examined, and here the mere Opinion of another will never be urged, but by those who think themselves weighty enough

to have their own *Ipse dixit* pass; or, are too weak to defend, and yet too obstinate to yield.

This Instance of 'אָלֵה' as a Verb from אלה is one of my Instances, as the Doctor observes, in the *Examiner Examined*, and I did, as Mr. C——did, took it as I found it. I hope that is no Fault. But why cannot I, as p. 19.

“ On this occasion *assure* myself, that I have even
“ two Passages to produce for the Interpretation
“ of the Verb אלה? ”

I should not care indeed if there was not one; for I will bring near forty for the Interpretation of the Noun Substantive feminine אלה; and twist that to the Construction of the Verb, and Noun Substantive masculine (to speak like a sanguine *Huthinsonian*) in spight of all Efforts to the contrary. But is there any particular Defect in the Author of the *Examiner Examined*, that he cannot *assure* himself, of what *there is no doubt to be made of*, as at the middle of the Page the Doctor allows there is not, that 'אָלֵה' in the Text above, signifies *be adjured*? If he is to blame in making himself sure, when he ought to doubt; I beg leave to make myself sure, of what *there is no doubt to be made of*.

But why is there no doubt to be made from the Context, that the Sense is, *Saul adjured the People*? *Pagninus*, and some of the best Lexicographers, did doubt of it. The Translators, it is true, so render it. But let us see how it would run, if 'אָלֵה' were construed as from the other Root, to act as resolutely bent upon a thing, headily, high, and others say, foolishly, madly.—*Ver. 24. The People was distressed that Day, for Saul אלה bad acted rashly, foolishly, with the People, saying, Cursed be every one that eateth Bread till the Evening.* A foolish and rash Action no doubt it was; and in which, in all Probability, *Saul* acted of his own Head, and against the Consent of the People; and as such, the Text seems to mention it, and which the Context seems to

to support. Ver. 29. *Then said Jonathan, my Father has troubled the Land,* and ascribes their losing the Fruits of his Victory, to this rash Curse denounced on the People. I dare say, had the Translators given us only this Sense of the Word here, it would never have been called in question. If the LXX had not thought it might have been taken in this Sense, why did they insert ἡγνοστεν αγνοιαν μεγαλην? And they say, right afterwards, that *Saul adjured the People*, because, saying, *cursed be, &c.* was an *Adjuration*, the *αγνοια* indeed of the LXX stands in the Place of **לְאָלָה** according to the Order of the Words, but then there is nothing to answer the Error or Folly they charge him with; and they seem to have been dubious which Sense to prefer, and so retained both. And now to return the Compliment made me by the Doctor, *he cannot on this Occasion assure himself, even of what there is no doubt to be made of*; for the Context, as well as the best Lexicographers, nay the LXX too, seem to render it very probable that **לְאָלָה** is not *adjured*, in this Place; and the entire dropping of the **נ**, helps to confirm it. I am not so much enquiring into the strict Meaning of the Words, as what Roots they belong to; and what Part of Speech they are of.

The next Instance, and the last the Doctor will allow to be of the Verb from **אָלָה**, is 1 Kings viii. 31. **לְאָלָתוֹ**. Here I put in my *non placet*; and say that this may as well be called a *Noun*, as a *Verb* in the *Infinitive*. It has just the same Letters as the Noun; and *to cause him to swear, or, for his Oath*, i. e. an Oath to him, the Effect, and Force or Virtue of an Oath, is just the same Thing.

There are two Passages in *Hos.* iv. 2. and x. 4. of which the Doctor says it may justly be doubted whether they be Verbs; there seems to me no Doubt of their being Nouns. Particularly, iv. 2. there is nothing to answer the *Verbs* **פְּרִצִּי**, if the preceding Words

are not Nouns. Our *English* puts in *by*, but there is nothing in the Text for it; leave the *Preposition* *by*, out, and it must either be, *Swearing* (or *Cursing*, *i. e.* *prophane Cursing*) *Lying*, &c. *multiply*, or, *the Curser, Lyar, Murderer, Thief, and Adulterer, are multiplied*. The latter is perhaps the most grammatical Construction, but the Sense the same either Way; and either Way, אלה is a Noun, and not a Verb here. But then the Doctor has been for several Pages undermining his own Argument before; betraying the Foundation of that *essential Difference* contended for betwixt אלה and אלה, which depended upon this Assertion, (turn back to p. 10.) that

“ אלה is formed like גָּלַד and other Verbs, which “ have the mutable ה and in *all the Instances* where “ it occurs as a Verb *undoubtedly*, the ה is wanting.”

Now there is but one the Doctor will allow to be *undoubtedly* from אלה, and that one I contest; and put in my Exception to, as at least a *neutral* Word. So that if ה אֵת does never *undoubtedly* occur as a Verb, or but once, the Argument is extremely weakened. And calling it *all the Instances*, when there is but one, must be allowed to be talking at large, and *too much like the H—ns*.

I am very sensible that this Concession, of there being but one certain Instance of אלה as a Verb was not designed for the Benefit of the H—ns. And am apt to think the Doctor had forgot (for *aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus*) that it betrayed his *grand essential Difference*, which the Merits of the Cause, as one main Hinge, was supposed to turn upon. However I will be as fair as possible, and make all the Concessions that can be desired. I will allow the Doctor, when he is contending for an *essential Difference*, betwixt the ה in the Verbs גָּבַה and אלה, *because in all the Instances where אלה occurs as a Verb undoubtedly, the ה is wanting*, that there are Instances now to justify the

the Expression, though there are not; I will allow this, because the Argument is lost, if there be not. On the other Hand, when he is disproving our Sense of אלה as a Verb, I will allow him, in Contradiction to the other Position, that there are no such Instances where it undoubtedly occurs as a Verb. To this first Case, it is said, first, That אלה is not deflected as נבה is. Suppose so. 2dly, That אלהים retaining the ה in the plural *Masculine*, ought to come from a Verb, that retains its ה in all the Instances where it occurs as a Verb, as נבה, whence נבאים is derived, does. But it does not follow that the Verbs must be deflected alike because the Nouns are; it appearing by many Instances that the Verbs *retain* or *change*, and sometimes drop the ה at Pleasure; and that in the same Deflections. We have a shrewd Suspicion that the immutable ה in נבה in itself has done so. And an undoubted Instance of it in נוה; which shews that there is no Rule to be built on this Observation, that Roots ending in ה, which retain that Letter in one Deflection must do so in all; nor sufficient Ground to argue backwards, that אלהים and נבאים must be deflected alike as Verbs, since נלה which deflects like נוה, as a Verb, does notwithstanding drop or change its ה, as a Noun; and as אל does in the Feminine, though not in the Masculine.

To the second Case, it is said, we have no Passages to produce for the Interpretation of the Verb אלה, and consequently have not the Root in *Hebrew*, *i. e.* in the Bible. I answer, we have the Meaning of the Word; and I should be glad to know what is the Root, but the radical Letters; those we have, since the *Noun* and *Verb Præter* have the same Letters.

On the Distinction above, betwixt a *mutable* and *immutable* ה in *Hebrew* is contested, likewise the Deri-

Derivation of אלהּ from the Hebrew Verb אלהּ, p. 16. and 36.

“ אלהּ departs from the common Rules of Inflection, according to which it ought to be אלהּי — p. 36. By what Rules of Inflection the Participle Passive of אלהּ, with its mutable ה — should be אלהּ (the Participle passive of an אלהּ, whose ה is unchangeable) rather than, אלהּי as was before observed, *be bath not shewn*; as might have been expected in a Case so singular.”

This if true to the Ear, is not so to the Mind; for if Mr. C—— had not shewn it, another in this Dispute hath. Mr. Bedford objected, as the Doctor does, that נבה was mappicked, or had an immutable ה, and therefore that גבוח would not justify אלהּ from אלהּ the Verb in Hebrew. Mr. C—— gave another Instance in ערוה; to these I added, Examiner Examined, p. 74. נואה, דוה, זעה, and רוח to which you may add נואה and רוח, which I believe are as many Instances as there are for נ. And as these are derived from Verbs which have what he calls the *mutable* ה, they are directly the Case in Point, *viz.* the *regular Inflection of the Participle passive of an אלהּ with its mutable ה.* Could the Doctor help seeing these Instances? Why then should he say, *That Mr. C—— had not shewn it as in a Case so singular might have been expected.* The Doctor, who promised not to repeat any old Objection but what he would set a new Face upon; or reinforce with additional Weight; or because it had not been yet replied to; or not satisfactorily answered, repeats this just as it stood before. If the Doctor says the Answer is not satisfactory to him, it would be proper to tell his Reader why he ought not to have said, that no Reply hath been made; and I am apt to think this was put in by some Hand not so conversant in this *Controversy*, as the Doctor

Doctor appears to be. And I must beg Leave to say, the Doctor is mistaken, when he says, p. 37.

“ If I mistake not, there is no Instance to be met with of the Participle *Pabul*.” I suppose he means *passive*, as we say **אָלָה** is,

“ Of any irregular Verb ending in **ת**, in which said Participle the **ת** is final.”

Because we had produced as many Instances, if I mistake not, on one Side, as he can produce on the other. And I am apt to imagine the learned Gentleman took up this Objection too much on trust from the Grammars, as Mr. *Bedford* had done before him; but do not think, he designedly overlooked the Answer we had given it; but if I may presume so far, it should be to desire him to look it over now with a little more Care and Attention.

• What **אָלָה** means considered.

The other main Point is the Sense of **אָלָה**, which I need not spend many Words in enquiring into, and which whoever has a clear Notion of, will not think the other Part worth giving himself much Trouble about.

Mr. *H—n* and *C—* say, that by *Aleim* are to be understood, *Persons who have sworn to a Covenant by laying themselves under a conditional Execration*. Dr. *Sharp* contends that **אָלָה** is properly to adjure or impose an Oath, which he proposes

“ As an equally consistent Sense with Mr. *C—’s*,
“ that may be put upon the Word in all the Places
“ to which he refers for his Interpretation, and in
“ all others where the Word occurs in Scripture,
“ p. 12. and p. 35. in about thirty of those (*viz.*
“ forty Places it occurs in) it signifies simply a
“ Curse, or the Penalty of an Oath, and cannot
“ consistently with Sense be translated Oath, in-
“ stead of Curse.”

I am content to take such Weapons as the Doctor is pleased to allow me, and will grant him that אלהּ is a Curse or Penalty of an Oath. I will grant also, that

“ It may be understood, and in some Texts must be understood, in the Sense of *Adjuration*, whence by one binds another to the Performance of a Thing by the Sanction of an Oath.”

Meaning by *Sanction*, the Curse which is the Penalty of an Oath.

The Doctor will think it an Advantage to his Cause, when it is granted that אלהּ is simply a Curse, and has no other Signification, because he says, p. 22.

“ It occurs indeed often as a Noun, and in Senfes not the same.”

And may perhaps think, that *swearing*, or taking and giving an Oath, and execrating, are different things, and not to be expressed by the same Word. That *Alab* in many Places does signify a Curse, is not to be disputed ; nor is it denied. This then I lay down as the sole Sense of *Alab*, a Bann, Curse, Execration, or Malediction. I must refer to a Passage or two in Scripture, which explain what they meant by this Word ; and in what manner they took and gave an Oath ; and bound themselves to each other for the Performance of a Covenant or Contract. The first I shall produce is that solemn Ratification of the Law, mentioned Deut. xxvii. 12, and referred to in many other Places. *These shall stand upon Mount Gerizim to bleſſ.—And these shall stand upon Mount Ebal to curse. And ſhall ſay with a loud Voice, Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the Words of this Law to do them, and all the People ſhall ſay Amen.* This is referred to Jer. xi. 3. *Thus ſaith the Lord God, Cursed be the Man that obeyeth not the Words of this Covenant, which I commanded your Fathers.—Then*

answered I and said, Amen, O Lord. Here I observe 1st, That to curse, was not to inflict the Curse, nor to wish it, only pronounce, or threaten it conditionally ; and yet to curse is proper and expressive. And the Person who pronounced the Curse, must be an *Execrator*, or Pronouncer of the Curse. 2dly, That saying, *cursed be he that*—so and so, was what they meant by the Word *Alab*. 3dly, That pronouncing those Words, *cursed be he, &c.* and answering *Amen*, was the Method of confirming or ratifying their Covenants, or binding to the Performance of them. It was the Method of administering an Oath ; and the Person it was pronounced to, was *adjured* by it, and took his Oath, and came into the Curse, as it is called, by saying *Amen*, to the Execration or Curse.

I must desire the Reader to attend these several Particulars ; for though they are very obvious, and I believe will scarce be called into question, yet they have not been sufficiently attended to.

That Cursing, or pronouncing a Curse, meant no ill Will, Malice, or was deemed harsh or ill Language, is plain from the Solemnity of the Thing ; the great Importance of it ; from its being the Command of God ; and performed by *Moses*, the High-Priest, and chief Magistrates, in a full Assembly of the People ; and as a solemn Profession of their Faith ; and Invocation of the Favour and Blessing of God upon them. Deut. xxix. 9. et seq. *Keep therefore the Words of this Covenant, and do them, that ye may prosper in all that ye do. Ye stand this Day, all of you before the Lord your God,—that thou shouldest enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into this Execration, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this Day ; that he may establish thee to Day for a People unto himself—neither with you only do I make this Covenant, and this Execration,—but also with him that is not here this Day.* It appears here that God

God did engage himself as a Party in the Covenant with his People, and to perform his Part under an *Alab*, we must therefore separate from the Word *Alab*, (Execration or Curse,) and so from the Word *Aleim*, (Execrators or Cursers) that Harshness or offensive Part of the Idea, the Word Cursing, or *Cursers* gives to the English Ear, when we use the Words as Translations of *Aleim*, as a Name of *Moses* and the other chief Magistrates who pronounced this Curse ; or of God, in whose Name and Stead it was pronounced, and so were the *Cursers* ; or for the Action performed, the Curse pronounced.

The saying or solemnly pronouncing, *cursed be that confirmeth not all these Words to do them*, is called the *Alab* many Times, Deut. xxix. 19. and *it come to pass when he beareth the Words of this Alab, Curse* ; that he shall *bless himself*, in his Heart, saying, I shall have Peace, tho' I walk in the *Imagination of my Heart*—the *Lord will not spare him*, and *כָל חַלָּה* all the Curse written in this Book shall lie upon him. *Daniel*, and other Prophets ascribe their Captivity to their not fearing this Curse, Ch. ix. 11. *Therefore חַלָּה the Curse is poured upon us*, and *הַשְׁבֻעָה*, that is written in the *Law of Moses*. So that saying, *cursed be*, was an *Alab*, or bringing these to, or over, whom it was pronounced, under an Execration. And *אלֹהָה* signifies simply a Curse or Execration. The Word is applied to, or stands only for a Curse. There was no more done than pronouncing those Words, *cursed be*, and answering *Amen*, and this is called the *אֱלֹהָה Curse* ; those who consented to the Curse, were bound by, subject or obnoxious to it, *conditionally* ; but still, and I shall repeat it, *אֱלֹהָה* is no more than the *Curse* : tho' the pronouncing the Curse, and consenting to it, was administering an Oath on one Hand, and taking it on the other.

Let me keep the Reader's Eye a little longer upon the Meaning of **אֲלָב**, an Execration; that there may be no Doubt, that administering and taking an Oath, and ratifying Covenants, were performed by, on one Hand pronouncing a Curse, and on the other consenting to it. So that in strict Propriety *Alab* is only a Curse, and yet intelligibly describes an Oath whether given or taken, or Covenant mutually sworn to.

Gen. xxiv. *Abraham* made the head Servant of his House to swear by the Lord, the God of Heaven, but the Form, or Words spoken on either Side are not mentioned; only the Ceremony of putting his Hand under *Abraham*'s Thigh; and the Oath taken is v. 41. twice called an *Alab*, an Execration. If according to the Form above, and another or two to be mentioned below, *Abraham* said, *cursed of Jebovah be thou if thou obeyest not my Voice in taking a Wife for my Son, of my Kindred*, it is properly expressed v. 41. *thou shalt be clear from this my Curse, when thou comest to my Kindred, and they will give not thee a Wife for him, thou shalt be clear from this my Curse.* And it runs much more naturally and intelligibly so. For if you translate it *Oath*, it must mean, clear from the Penalty of the Oath.

Gen. xxvi. 28. *Abimelech* says to *Isaac*, *let there be an Alab betwixt us, and let us make a Covenant with thee, if thou shouldest do us any hurt; as we have done thee only good, and sent thee away in Peace, now thou blessed of Jebovah.* Take these Words together, and it is more natural to translate it as the LXX do, simply, a Curse; for to say, *let there be now an Oath betwixt us, if thou shouldest do us any hurt*, is not altogether so natural, as to say, *Let there be now a Curse (pronounced) betwixt us, if thou shouldest do us any hurt.*

Dr. Sharp seems to be of another Opinion, and says, p. 33.

“ To interpret $\alpha\rho\alpha$ (the LXX Word for אלה) “ simply of a Curse between them would be most “ unnatural.”

But the learned Gentleman doth not seem to have particularly considered what a Curse was ; for tho’ the pronouncing a Curse in the Manner they were wont to do on these Occasions, implied, they looked on themselves as bound by it, or Subject to it in case of Contempt ; yet the simple Word does signify nothing but simply a Curse ; or, though it may be unnatural to suppose they had no Design in pronouncing a Curse betwixt themselves ; yet it is not unnatural to interpret $\alpha\rho\alpha$ simply of a Curse. And had the Doctor attended to his own Quotation from *Lud. de Dieu*, who had no Turn to serve by his Remark, he possibly would not have called it *most unnatural* to interpret $\alpha\rho\alpha$, or אלה here simply, of a Curse, “ *licebit intelligere*, says that good Critick, *pro more execrationis formulam.*” If we may gather from hence the Form of Execration, then the Word must simply mean *Execration*, and the Doctor had not collected the true Idea of the Word, as plain as this good Critick makes it. But neither he nor any Man else deserves to be called a good Critick, for rendering בָּרָך *Maledictus*, in this or any other Place of the Bible. To *bless* and to *curse* are Ideas too opposite to be annexed to the same Word by the Spirit of Wisdom ; and a Writing capable of such opposite Constructions can never deserve the Title of *Oracles of God*. I have occasionally construed every Passage where some had so mistaken the Word, and am convinced in myself that I have not left much room to dispute them, and say so, tho’ I am told, that every true and modest Writer is less sanguine than to think what he says to be right. It is a Position of Mr. H——n’s, that every Root in Hebrew has but one Meaning or Idea belonging to it, in which it interferes with no other, or that no one Word has

two Meanings; nor any two Words the same Meaning. If this be made out, the Perfection and Certainty of the *Hebrew* will set its Value so high, that a Man of the least Gall would be apt to look on the Person, who should attempt to rob him of so invaluable a Jewel, in the Light our Lord did St. Peter, when he called him Satan, though he were as high in the Church as that Apostle was. Mr. H—n has shewn the Truth of his Position in so many Instances, that it leaves little doubt, but it holds in all. But to go on with *Alab*,

Lev. v. 1. *If a Person shall sin, and the Voice of אלה, the Curse, or Pronoucer of a Curse, be heard, then he that was a Witness, or saw or knew, if he do not declare, shall bear his Iniquity.* So that an *Adjuration or Excommunication* is the same thing. This appears also from 1 Kings viii. 31. and Prov. xxix. 24. which speak of the Curse pronounced by the High-Priest, in order to discover the Truth. *If any Man trespasses against his Neighbour, and a Curse be laid upon him, to bring him under a Curse, and the אלה, (one would think it meant the Person who pronounced the Curse rather than) the Curse, come before thine Altar, in this House, then bear thou in Heaven, and do and judge thy Servants.* By which it seems the High-Priest was to have an Answer from the Oracle, in case the Curse did not bring out the Truth.

Numb. v. 21. In the Trial of Jealousy, the Priest shall swear the Woman by the Oath **הַלֹּה** of the Execration; that is, shall pronounce over her as it follows, the Lord make thee a Curse, so that here also, cursed be thou of the Lord, or, the Lord make thee a Curse, is what we call administering an Oath, and

² Now is applied to lifting up the Hands, Eyes, Prayer, Tongue, &c. and so may here signify, if a Curse be pronounced on him, or spoken over him.

and the Party, as the Woman here, gave Consent or took an Oath, by answering, *Amen, Amen.*

1 Sam. xiv. 24. Saul pronounces over all the People, Cursed be he that eateth Bread till the Evening. And it is said, ver. 26. the People feared the Oath, but Saul only said, Cursed be he that eateth.

It appears plainly from all these Passages, that *cursing*, that is saying, *Cursed be*, was the Form of giving and taking an Oath, and of confirming their Covenants, and translating it by *Adjuration, Swearing*, or the like, clouds the Sense, and loses the Reader a clear Idea of the Matter.

Two Observations more may be made from the Passages we have been considering, pertinent to the Subject of our Dispute. 1st, That he who pronounced the Curse, might *include himself in it*, though he spoke in general Terms. 2dly, That the pronouncing a Curse, was an Act of too great Weight and Consequence, to be entrusted in all Hands. It was a Branch of Power that could not properly belong to any, but who was invested with Authority, and bore the Sword of God. The High-Priest had this Power, because he could vindicate the Dignity of it by applying to the Oracle, though he had not the Power as Kings have, of Life and Death. Inferiors could not pronounce or execute a Curse on their Superiors; we find all along that they are Kings, or the chief Magistrate who exercise this Authority. And I think we have no Instance to the contrary, unless perhaps in a Case of Necessity, or its abuse by wicked People, who are charged with it in the *Psalms*, and by the Prophet *HoSEA*. *Saul* pronounces it on his Subjects, the High-Priest on Parties accused, and does it as the immediate Mouth of God. *Abimelech*, as a Sovereign Prince, pronounces one betwixt himself and *Isaac*; and *Isaac*, as God's Prince, **הַלְּהִיכָּן**.

or bus ed of mawwah, baybow, onos datt to end all ed
or find us in giv as new and his

נָשָׁן, * pronounced the Curse likewise. But it does not appear that they pronounced it on each other, but *betwixt them*, as if each had said, *Cursed be he that keepeth not the Words of this Covenant*, and so each included himself; be that as it will, each had a Right and Authority to pronounce a Curse.

When God confirmed his Covenant with his People, by the Mouth of *Moses* and the *Levites*, *Deut. xxvii.* cited above, the Words are general. *Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the Words of this Law to do them*: Here *Moses* and the *Levites* who pronounced the Curse, were as much included, as the People they spoke to; as much under the Male-diction, as they. The Emperor only has Power to denounce the *Bann of the Empire*, and yet commissions others to proclaim it. So in the last Instance, God only can denounce the Curse, but delegates the proclaiming of it to *Moses*; and *Moses* orders the *Levites* to do it, or joins them with himself, that there might be Mouths enow to proclaim it in the Ears of all the People; but it was the *Bann* of *Jehovah*, not theirs. And if Inferiors have not a power over their Superiors, the Superiors must pronounce the Curse for themselves, or speak in such general Terms, as include themselves. So *Saul* spoke in general Terms, *cursed be he that eateth Bread*, and was as much involved in the Curse, as much included under the Male-diction, as the People were; there was no Exception made. *Ezek. xvii. 13.* *The King of Babylon has taken of the King's Seed, and made a Covenant with him, and brought him* בָּאֵלָה *into an Execration*. The Conqueror pronounces the Curse, but includes himself. It is to ratify a Covenant between them; that *Zedekiah* should submit to him, and then that he would support the Kingdom of

Judah

* So the Sons of *Heb* acknowledged *Abraham* to be; and so he and *Isaac* were, as being the great First-born.

Judah whilst he did so. *Ver. 14. For the Kingdom to be subject ; not to lift up itself, viz. in Rebellion against him, the next Article was, to keep his Covenant, לְעַמְדָה to support it, viz. the Kingdom, or that he might support it.* Here are Conditions on both sides, Submission on one, and Protection promised on the other. And the King of *Babylon* bringing *Zedekiah* into an Execration, no doubt, was solemnly saying as on other Occasions, *Cursed be he that confirmeth not these Words to do them.* And this is called the King of *Babylon's Execration*, by God, *ver. 16*, because he pronounced it. God says of the same King of *Judah*, *ver. 19. Surely my Curse that he hath despised—Even it will I recompense upon his own Head.* This is spoken of God's Curse on the People in general, and pronounced when they came out of *Egypt*. The 11th Chapter of *Jeremiah* seems to put the Matter out of Dispute. It is true that *Abraham's Execration* is called *his*, because he pronounced it, and laid an Obligation upon his Servant. The King of *Babylon's* may be called *his* for the same Reason ; but the Point aimed at by the Doctor, *p. 28.* is not at all reached by this Distinction ; because they who pronounced the Curse, often included themselves, which must be according to the Nature of the Occasion they pronounced it upon.

The Passages, *Deut. xxvii. and xxix.* may help to clear the Passages in *Ezekiel*, but want not those to clear them. They are sufficiently clear of themselves, and if sufficiently attended to, will clear up a great Number of others. It is of the Passages, *Deut. xxix.* the Doctor speaks, *p. 28, 9.*

“ Now there is no more room to infer from
 “ hence, that God himself took an Oath at that
 “ Time, than there was in the former Passage,
 “ where the King of *Babylon's Adjuration* was also
 “ called God's לְהָא.”

But

But it should first have been shewn that the King of Babylon's Curse was called God's, which by no means appears. Zedekiah had despised God's *Alah*, and the King of Babylon's both; and was to suffer for both. *So that I conceive, with Submission,* that these Passages, cited by Mr. C——, make as much for the Proof of *Alein* from *Alah*, in his Sense and Exposition of the Word, as he thought they did; it appearing that the King of Babylon was bound to the Performance of a Covenant with Zedekiah, under a conditional Malediction. And when Jehovah, the ever-blessed Persons of the Trinity, described in Types, *all their Counsel*, the Mystery of *Christ*, the *eternal Purpose* which he purposed in *Christ Jesus* our Lord, *before the World began*, when this was described by *Moses*, to the Church of God, and he was in the Name, and on the Behalf of God, to ratify the whole by pronouncing with a loud Voice,—*Cursed be he that obeyeth not the Words of this Covenant*, God brought himself under the *Alah* he brought them, and by the same general Words. They were the Words of God which *Moses* spake, and he spake them as his Words. And each Person of *Jehovah* had a Part to perform in the Law or Christian Covenant: For the outward Law was but a Description of the several Particulars contained in the Plan of Redemption. And every Person who had any Part to perform, was bound by this Curse to perform it; each Person to his own peculiar distinct Part; all to their several Parts; and consequently Jehovah to their respective Parts. The Words are general and absolute, and must include every Party in the Covenant, or no one.

The Execration, thus solemnly denounced, must be, what it is so often called, God's Bann or Curse: He only has Power to execute the dreadful Part of this Arrest. But was this Oath taken, or to speak

more intelligibly, was this Curse denounced before the World? Or, Is this the first Time that God pronounced it? Not the first Time, for the Covenant and *Alab* with *Abraham*, was to the same Purport as this, nay, was the same Covenant as this with the Children of *Abraham*: And that was the Gospel which was preached unto *Abraham* in these Words, *I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall all the Families of the Earth be blessed.* The Law or Christian Covenant was made before the World: The Terms of it were settled, and the Method and Manner of Redemption planned out before Man fell. God *purposed it before the World began.* The Oath, or in the Scripture Style, the denouncing a Curse on every one who should refuse to confirm all the Words of the Law, and say, *Amen, Amen* to it, was the *formal* Part, or making it a Law, making the Act valid. And this Curse must have been pronounced when the Law was first made. The Persons of the Trinity, each for himself, says, *Cursed be every one that confirmeth not all this Law.* Not to bind themselves to one another; but they bind Man to accept or suffer, and themselves to grant, the *terms proposed*, and to bless those who accept them; they who do accept being under no other Curse than this. Each Party, God on one side, and Man on the other, must be mutually bound; it could in no Sense else be called a Covenant. And if no Curse had been pronounced by the Supreme in this Covenant, the *Confirmation* would have been wanting. It must be God who pronounces it, Man cannot bind God, but God can bind himself and Man, to the Performance of it. *ob a vissi spon si bni bns vobis pmi usi*
 The Covenant of Grace between *Jehovah Aleim* was not, as we make Contracts with one another; either to lay themselves under an Obligation to each

each other, in virtue of such Contract ; nor was it a Bargain or Contract made with Man, that our Obligation to observe it should be considered as arising from our own Consent, and joining in, or agreeing to it ; but these great and merciful Persons who foresaw the Fall of Man, concerted together the necessary Steps to be taken, to conquer his Enemy for him, and rescue him out of his Hands, and agreed upon such Measures as are most suitable to that Purpose, and best befitting their Glory, their Justice and Wisdom. And considering Men as rebel Subjects, wavering in their Allegiance, because liable to be imposed upon by the Treachery and Artifices of an Enemy, and under Apprehension of Mischief from him and his Adherents, they swear to defend them against all his Attempts, and to revenge their Quarrel upon him ; and solemnly bind themselves to grant such Terms, and receive into Mercy, any who after they had been deceived, should return to their Duty ; and confirm this gracious Promise by the most solemn Tye possible ; they pronounce those Words which carry *Terror* with them, and yet are the strongest Confirmation of our Hopes, *cursed be every one that confirmeth not all this Covenant.*

To put a Case. There are three Persons, like the *Triumviri in Rome*, who have an equal Share in the supreme Power, and an absolute just Right to govern such a City. A Competitor sets up against them, and draws the People into a Revolt. These three have a sufficient Power to destroy the rebel City, but would recover it to their Obedience, and chuse to win their Hearts, rather than force their Persons. They consult together upon this great Emergency, and find it necessary to do so and so. They resolve accordingly, and proceeding to put this Purpose into Execution, solemnly protest before-hand, that upon such Terms only,

they will forbear from Justice or Vengeance ; they swear then, when they agreed upon them, that no other should be offered, but that these should be accepted, and use such a Form of Words, as binds them to offer or grant, and leaves their Subjects no Security but in accepting. When these Terms come to be proposed, and any one of the Rebels accepts and testifies his Consent and Submission, he is properly received into the Covenant, but not as a Party, or one who had any Share in making it ; nor can the Covenant or Oath, as above, be in any View looked on, as a Contract binding these co-equal to each other, but to concern or refer to their Subjects only, so far as the *Council*, thus taken and confirmed, can be considered in the View of an Oath and Covenant. If in their Wisdom it appear necessary, that one of themselves should lay aside the Dress and Character of a King, and go into the City in the Form of one of their Subjects, as an Herald to proclaim, or as an *Agent* to do, what was proper to be done, by joining in Person, to assist those who were best disposed ; such a Condescension does not imply that he was not a Co-equal ; nor ought he to be looked upon as not being co-equal, though he is acting this under Part, and appearing as if divested of all Power : Nor is the Covenant or Oath, by way of Contract with him, to perform his Part or to oblige him to do it, or assure them that he would. He voluntarily consents to this as his Part, the other two take other Parts upon them ; and they have no Doubt or Distrust of each other, but their Subjects may ; and therefore they condescend to give them the greatest Assurance they can desire. Now apply the Words of the Curse pronounced by *Jehovab Aleim*, *Cursed is he that keepeth not all the Covenant* : The Speaker here is as much under the Malediction as the Persons spoken to, but the Speaker is not bound

bound but to the Persons he speaks to ; the Persons he speaks to are not himself, but Men. And it is necessarily implied, that he *only* is cursed who doth not keep it. It was necessary, surely to agree upon these Terms, before they come to talk with their Subjects ; for how could they offer them till they had agreed upon them ? And how could they keep up their Authority, and their Vassals at the proper Distance, but by *sending in their own Terms* ? Not such as they had concerted with their Vassals, but such as they thought proper to give. And if they were not duly executed, signed and sealed, or confirmed by Oath, that is by an *Alab* annexed, how would it appear to the People they could trust to them, or what Right could they have to plead them in *Law* at any time afterwards ? Therefore the Curse must be denounced before their Subjects knew any thing of the Matter ; and such a Curse might as well be pronounced before the People, whom it was to affect, were in being, as while they were at a Distance, and not in hearing when it was done. The Curse pronounced by *Moses*, in the Name of God, is said to reach to those not present, and not born, *not with you only do I make this Covenant and this Curse, but with them that are not here with us this Day.* It was to reach their latest Posterity, and does so at this Day. From the Nature of the Covenant and Curse, it did not require the Consent of the Party it is offered to, as being invalid without it ; though when divulged to Men, it requires a Consent or Submission to be testified by owning it holy, just, and good ; and the Terms and Ratification must come together. The Terms were settled before the World, and therefore must be confirmed or ratified before.

We see that pronouncing a Curse in the Manner described, was the Method Superiors took to bind their Subjects to them, and *themselves* to their Subjects,

jects, and to confirm their Contracts. The Superior pronounced the Words, and the Inferior said, *Amen* to it. It is certain that he that speaks is the Speaker, and he that curseth, is the Curser, or Execrator, meaning the *Pronoucer of the Words of a Curse*. We have seen that אלהָ is a Curse ; we know that the same Letters in Hebrew, are the Verb *Præter*, *Noun Subst. Masc.* and *Fem.* both in the *Singular* ; though *Masc.* and *Fem.* *Plural* differ, and therefore אלהָם the *Noun Subst. Masc. Plural* is *Persons who have pronounced a Curse*, i. e. spoke the Words, and so the Agents, the Cursers. The Scriptures describe at large what this Curse was, what it contained, and what Design it was pronounced with, *viz.* As the solemn Assurance from the Part of God to Man, that if *he believed, he should be saved ; if not, that he should be damned*. And so we are sufficiently warranted in defining this Word as a Name of God, to put into the Definition, *Persons who have bound themselves in Covenant under a Malediction*. And were the Word Execrators or Cursers used in English, as it is in Hebrew, *Cursers*, when applied to God, would sound what *Moses* calls it, a glorious and tremendous Name. Fallen Man may plead this Curse in his Favour, so as to be free from every other Curse. It carries Terror as well as firm Confidence to his Mind ; and speaks God our Protector, our Confederate ; and a severe Avenger of Sin. A King grants Lands and Hereditaments to a certain Subject ; his Nobles, some of them, through Envy or Pride, resolve to obstruct his taking or keeping Possession ; the King publishes an Arrest,

“ in Consideration of his Duty and Affection to my
 “ Person, I grant such and such Lands to *M. N.*
 “ and strictly command all my Subjects whatever,
 “ to no ways molest him themselves, or permit any
 “ others to do so, and I will support and assist
 “ them with my Forces in case of need ; and,
 “ cursed

“ cursed be every one who keepeth not all these Words.” Would not such a Subject have Reason to rejoice in such a Curse, and boast of his King under the Title of the Pronoucer of it? Would it not carry Terror to his Enemies, as well as Comfort to himself?

This Title of God cannot be mistaken in *Hebrew*. The People cannot be *Aleim*; they had no Right nor Authority to pronounce a Curse; nor did they do it. They only expressed their Submission or Approbation. So it is a Mistake to say,

“ That all the People and Subjects who took Oaths were as properly *Aleim* as their Superiors;”

The People not being so in any Sense. They could neither pronounce the Curse for themselves nor others, but *took their Oaths* under them who did pronounce it. Nor was the Person whom this Curse was denounced upon, *actually* or really accursed or execrated, and so was not אלה; but was נשבע made *sufficient*, viz. to be credited or trusted; the Hopes of Heaven and Fear of God, being thus staked for his Security.

And now, if I may do it without Offence, I would apply these Observations to the Exceptions made by Dr. Sharp, p. 35. &c.

“(1.) Mr. C—— has produced no Instance of אלה being applied to a Person as a Name or Appellation.”

This is true, but not to the Purpose. If the Idea or Meaning of אלה be as Mr. C—— gives it, by Parity of Reason אלהים will be the Persons who swear; other personal Nouns being so formed. And the Doctor’s Remark,

“ Unless he looked upon Aleim to be an Instance, which yet cannot be allowed, because it is the very Thing in Question, whether it be deduced from *Alab* or not,”

Seems to mistake the Case; it not being said by Mr. C—— that Aleim was ever applied to a Swearer,

Swearer, but in the Name contended about; and he had no occasion to produce an *Instance*. Nor was the Thing in question here, whether *Aleim* be deduced from *Alah*; but whether the Noun Subst. Masc. plural of הָאֵל to *swear*, be not אָלָהִים *Swearers*, or *Persons who have sworn, &c.* his Words are, “ אָלָה when applied to a Person, as a Name or “ Appellation, signifies a Swearer to a Covenant,” which it most certainly does when applied to a Person, whether it had ever been so applied before or no.

(2.) When the Doctor cites Mr. C—— saying,
 “ *As a Noun expressive of an Action, it signifies an Oath, and that it occurs about forty Times in Scripture, and always in this Sense,*” and then remarks upon him,
 “ I fear he has taken this too much upon trust.
 “ For in about thirty of those Places, it signifies simply a *Curse*, or the Penalty of an Oath; and cannot consistently with Sense, be translated *Oath* instead of *Curse*.”

I fear he hath taken Mr. C——’s Meaning too much upon trust; for Mr. C—— doth not say, it occurs forty Times as an *Oath*; but if you include *Male-diction* in the Definition, as Mr. C—— does, and what he says is true enough. His Words are not cited very exactly; and if you look into the *Sermon*, p. 8. “ *It occurs about forty Times, and always in this Sense,*” does not refer to *Oath* alone, but the foregoing Part of the Sentence also. And when the Doctor says, *in about thirty of those Places it signifies simply a Curse*, I fear he has not a clear distinct Idea of what they meant by *Alah*, or how they administer’d an *Oath*; for *Alah* does signify simply a *Curse*, and yet was an *Oath* given and taken: because an *Oath* was a *Curse* pronounced and consented to. And the Distinction the Doctor makes in the next Lines betwixt giving and taking an

an Oath, is equally confused; at least a useless Distinction to his Argument.

“ Though it does indeed signify *an Oath*,—yet “ it is not necessarily to be understood in *his Sense* “ of *Oath*, whereby one binds oneself to the Per- “ formance of any thing, but—whereby one binds “ another: ”

Because it appears, that in confirming of Covenants, which was the Case betwixt *Jehovab Aleim* and Mankind, he that pronounced the Words of the Curse did bind himself, and that by the same Words, he did the other.

And therefore when the Doctor says,

“ —(3.) He (Mr. C——) seems to have thought “ his Evidence would have proved more than it “ does, since it appears not from any of his Texts “ either that אלה is *applicable* to a Person; or if it “ was that it signifies a Person *sworn to a Covenant*. ”

The Doctor himself seems to shew that he was not aware how far Mr. C——’s Evidence would go; since one of his *four* Texts would alone prove all that he seems to have thought the four would do, as I have shewn above. And whether *אלה* applied or no to a Person, is certainly *applicable* to one; for if *אלה* the Noun Subst. Fem. be a *Curse pronounced*; *אלה* may be the Noun Subst. Masc. also, and be the Agent, the Pronouncer of it, as נבה is both Masculine and Feminine; so that גביהֵט, גביהֵת, גביהֵם, גביהֵת, and גביהֵה are parallel to אלהֵם, אלהֵת, אלהֵם, אלהֵת. See *Prov. xvi. 5.* and *18.* every one that exalts his Heart; or every Lifter up of his Heart, ver. *18.* before a Fall is גביהֵה רוח *elatio Spiritus*.

Neither (4.) has Mr. C—— overlooked the first Sense of אלה, when he construes Aleim Persons bound in Covenant under a Malediction, and אלה execrated, or, *accursed really*, because Persons were bound in Covenants, or sworn to perform them,

by

by being *curst conditionally*.—As the Words are cited, p. 36. viz. *to confirm by Oath, to bind a Person to fulfil, &c.* and this set in opposition to *accursed*, it gives an Advantage to the Doctor's Argument, by setting the Difference at first View much wider, than it would have been, had Mr. C—'s Definition of the Word been given at large; but I suppose this was accidental.

The Doctor concludes,

“ The candid Reader must judge for himself, “ whether I have, or have not made out the thing I “ have been endeavouring to shew, viz. that it is “ doubtful and questionable, whether this Word does “ ever signify *simply to swear*, as a Verb; or *simply* “ *an Oath as a Noun.*”

Then he has not sufficiently attended to the Merits of the Question, or fully reached them, as he acknowledges others had not before him; for the Definition of *Alab* by Mr. H— and Mr. C— is, *to bind a Person to fulfil certain Terms under the Penalty of a conditional Malediction.* Sermon, p. 8. Mr. H—'s Words are, *In Man who takes an Oath, it is to imprecate a conditional Malediction upon himself, if he perform not the Covenant.* I have shewn that a Curse was pronounced, and assented to, for that Purpose; so that their Definition will stand, and yet the Word *simply* signify a Curse or Malediction. And proving it does not signify *simply to swear*, or *simply an Oath*, is falling very short of what was to be proved, and must be so before their Account of the Word will be in the least affected. Their's is a *full comprehensive and judicious* Account of the Word. It takes in the simple radical Idea of the Word; and the Manner and Design of pronouncing a Curse; it is directly conformable to the Use of the Word in Scripture; and their Construction of *Aleim* is just the Sense it must have as a *personal Noun*, or *Appellation*

tion of Persons, if you inflect it into that Part of Speech.

The next Thing observed by the Doctor is, p. 38.

“ That tho’ *Alcim* should be a Derivative from “ the Root אלהָ, it may not take its Meaning from “ the Verb in *Kal*, but the Verb in *Hipbil*.”

But אלהָ is not the Verb in *Hipbil*, nor אלהִים, a Noun or Participle from *Hipbil*, but from *Kal*. I find in the Grammars that מפקידים is the plural of the Participle in *Hipbil*, and פקידים in *Kal*. Perhaps I have not guessed right at the Doctor’s Meaning, for either his Manner of Writing here is less *perspicuous* than usual, or he contradicts himself, when he argues, that tho’ it comes from the Root אלהָ, (which is the Verb in *Kal*,) it may not take its Meaning from the Verb in *Kal*.

“—It is from the *Sense of this Mood*, that they “ who formerly espoused the Etymology, seem to “ have taken and understood the Derivation.”

The Taking a Derivation from the *Sense of a Mood* is to me very obscure ; if it means only that אלהִים signifies *Imposers of an Oath* on others, and not *Swearers* themselves, this is what was so largely spoken to before, from p. 12. to p. 35. And it matters not to the H——ns which Mood’s Sense you take and understand the Derivation from.

Robertson proposes the *Hipbil* Sense, but did not altogether approve of it, “ there being according to “ him, no verbal Root of it extant among the He- “ brews,” (some Hand, I suppose that of the Arabic Doctor has added here,) “ unless it be the Arabic “ *Aliba, to worship, &c.*” very judiciously ; making Robertson say, or saying it for him, that there is no Root of it extant in Hebrew except what is not extant in Hebrew ; for *Aliba* is not extant in Hebrew ; if it had, they need not have gone to the Arabic for it.

The Exceptions against Mr. H——n's and C——s Account of the Derivation of *Aleim* from *Alab* arising from the *Import* and *Use* of the Word in Scripture, whether Verb or Noun, being I hope got pretty well over, and shewn to arise from the Objector's less *clear Conceptions* of the Import and Use of that Word in Scripture, than Mr. H——n's *less perspicuous* Manner of Writing, I proceed to the

“ Further Difficulties which attend this Derivation in the Sense that he approves.” The first is *p. 41, &c.* that

“ It conveys an Idea that does not rightly agree with the Divine Nature, Attributes, and *Perfections*.—The Divine Persons themselves could want no Assurances from each other.—As for their swearing to each other,—there is nothing I presume in Scripture to countenance it.” *p. 43.*

Very true ; and the Objector must be excused for guessing that Mr. H——n meant so ; because when a Man writes in the less *perspicuous Manner*, what he doth not write cannot be perspicuous more or less. So it is H——n's Fault in not having said it plain enough to justify the Objection. Mr. H——n all along supposes the Oath of God to be relative to his Creatures ; to bind themselves to us, and us to them ; not themselves to each other ; at least I do not recollect where he has said otherwise ; in a Passage cited by the Doctor, *p. 64.* he says, “ Though the *Aleim* cannot lye nor break their Covenant, or *Oath*, yet they can make a Covenant each with the others, and swear to perform it, and they tell us the Reason,—*To shew unto the Heirs of Salvation the Immutability of his Counsel.*” The *Oath* was to us, not to themselves according to Mr. H——n ; and so he says *Trinity of the Gentiles*, *p. 365, 370.* “ The Covenant, and Promise, and *Oath* was to give really, what was first, for a long Time, represented typically.” The Covenant

nant then was for us, not themselves; as well as the *Oath* and *Promise*, according to Mr. H——n. And it would have been but ingenuous, as the Doctor is on other Occasions, to have shewn that Mr. H——n or C—— had said or meant otherwise, before he had supposed it by Way of Foundation for an Objection. I think they might as well have been charged with making Kings *Alein*, because they swear to each other, and not to their Subjects. From whatever Cause it be, which I shall say nothing about, lest I give Offence, that this strong Prejudice against Mr. H——n is cherished by the orthodox Clergy: I have very often found, they carry it to that Height, as not to have Patience to read him with that Attention, which is necessary to understand a News-Paper. And they oftener object to him, from not seeing into him, than *seeing through him*, as some of them would be thought to do.

The Doctor supports this Objection of his with saying, that,

“ With regard to himself, when there were “ no Creatures in being, capable of receiving any “ such Assurances by such Actions, his *Promises* or “ *Oaths* seem to have no Place, since the Divine “ Persons themselves could want no Assurances “ from each other.”

And these two Objections, of its being needless for them to swear to each other, and useless or impossible to swear to Creatures not then in being, are twisted together through three or four Pages; as if they ought not to be separated, different as they are from each other. Which whether it be owing to the less perspicuous manner of Writing; or from having less clear Ideas of the Subject; or from what other Cause, I do not presume to determine; but to that Part of the Objection, for the other doth not belong to us, *with regard to God, when*

when there were no Creatures, his Promises or Oaths seem to have no Place. And yet the Grace of God was given us in Christ Jesus, before the World began. — Hope of eternal Life, which God that cannot lie, promised before the World began, Tit. i. 2, and in many other Places. The Oath might have a Place, as well as the Promise and Gift, one would think, before the World. The Doctor says, *The Promises or Oath seem to have no Place before the world*; the Apostle says, the Promises actually had a Place when there were no Creatures in Being whom they concerned. And Jehovah might as well make a Covenant with *Adam* before he was in being, as with the Children of the *Israelites*, before they were born, cited above.

But though it is wrong in Mr. H——n to say, as supposed, that Jehovah made a Covenant with each other, by way of *Pact* with themselves, yet it is right in Dr. Sharp, p. 42.

“ Whatever is represented in Scripture as a *Pact* or Covenant between the Father and Son, for the Redemption of Mankind—.”

Which seems to suppose they did make a *Pact* with each other. H——n indeed is supposed to say more, that they gave each other their Oath to perform it; but the Difficulty is very near as great in supposing they made a *Pact*, or solemn Promise to each other, as if the supreme Being was capable of any further Obligation, than what is conceived to arise from the Necessity of his Nature. But here the Comment will help us; this *Pact* and Covenant is not a *Pact* and Covenant, but only,

“ The will and Pleasure of the Father freely giving his Son; and the Will and free Consent of the Son to fulfil the Pleasure of the Father.”

I hope I should give no just Cause of Offence, if I were to ask, how the Will and Pleasure of the Father to give the Son, and of the Son to give himself,

self, comes under the Nature and Condition of a Covenant, and where it is represented as such? Whether in Scripture, or by some Divines only? Why an Equal need covenant to bestow himself; or one Equal can be supposed to will and please to give another away, whom he has no Prerogative over, and that Other need covenant or bargain, as it were, for Leave to give himself, are Difficulties, that seem to me, to want clearing up; though, to be sure, it is all Sense, and Truth, and consonant to Scripture, or the Doctor would not have laid it down for such. If by *Father* and *Son*, the Doctor means two of these Persons of Jehovah, *co-equal* and *co-eternal*; I should imagine, might I presume to say so, that he mistakes some of the Scripture Expressions; and makes that one Person's of the Essence giving another Person of the Essence, which the Scripture means of Jehovah, the God in Christ, giving his human Nature as a Sacrifice for us; and doth not distinguish, when *the Father* is the Essence, and when a Person of the Essence. It is said, *that God gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish*; but this is no Covenant, nor is there any Reason to call it a Covenant betwixt God and the only-begotten Son. The *only begotten Son*, is not the Divinity, but Humanity of Christ. The God in Christ gave his Body, (*viz.* the Man Christ) a Sacrifice for Sin. And Christ, as Man, was the Son, begotten of God; and as he was the *only Man* so *begotten*, he was the *only-begotten*. And it follows further, that if *the Man* was begotten of God, no other Person was begotten of God; unless there could be more *only-begottns* than one. Christ, as Man, was *begotten, not made*; *Adam was made, not begotten*; but both are called Sons of God, and here the Difference is apparent, and Christ may be said to have been *begotten before the World*, as the Grace of God

is said to be given us in him before the World; or as he is said to be *the Lamb slain from the Foundation of it*. I hope the Reader will excuse a short Digression not very foreign to the Point in Hand.

If you read *Luke* iii. 23. *Jesus himself began to be about thirty Years of Age, being (as was supposed the Son Joseph) from Heli, from Mattath, and so on*; a Difficulty vanishes at once, which a Piece, supposed to be Dr. *Conyers Middleton's*, represents, as *not possible to be cleared up by all the Wit of Man*, for here it is not *Joseph* who is said to be *the* *Jesus*, but *Christ* himself; not only the Change of Expression, *Son of Joseph*, and afterwards (not *Son of*, but only) *from or of Heli*, seems to require the putting *In one* *the* *Jesus* *with* *the* *Christ* together, but the Reason of the Thing, on more Accounts than one. It is evident *St. Matthew* makes *Joseph* descend from another Branch of the House of *David*; and *Christ* had no *human Father*; *St. Luke* therefore could not say, that *Christ* was begotten of *Heli*, but he could say, he was *the* *Jesus*, *of or from Heli*; which *Heli*, by this Account, was Father to the *Virgin*, and so *Christ* was from him by the Mother's side. What induced the Translators to give the Turn to the Words they have, and make so wide a Difference betwixt the two *Evangelists*, I know not. Nor do I know whether others have reconciled that Difference as I do or no; but the Construction, that *Jesus being, by Supposition, Son of Joseph, was really descended from Heli*, appears so natural to me, that I chose to put it down here, when we were talking of *Christ* as Son of God, which that holy Thing conceived and born of the *Virgin Mary* most certainly was. *Christ*, God-man is our High-Priest, and every High-Priest, says the Apostle, is ordained to offer Gifts and Sacrifices; wherefore it was of Necessity, that this should have something to offer, *Heb*, viii. 3.

He therefore gave his own Body, the only-begotten Son of God. Some Divines have mistaken the Word *Father* in Scripture, and always construe it *one*, and the *first Person* of the Trinity; and *Son of God*, they would make another Person of the Essence, and take the Idea from the Relation of Father and Son betwixt Men, and though it runs them upon a thousand Contradictions to themselves and Common Sense; and they cannot help seeing the fatal Effects which the Dispute about the Trinity defended on that Footing has produced in the Nation, yet &c. &c. Let the impartial Reader but look at Mr. H——n's *Glory and Gravity*, p. 235, &c. and see whose manner of Writing is most perspicuous on this important Subject, and most consonant to our Creeds, his, or that of some others I need not name.

But to return to the Exceptions against Mr. C—'s Construction of *Aleim*.

“ He owns that אלה signifies more than it may be allowed to mean, when spoke of the Divine Persons. So I collect from his Words in p. 9, “ Let the Words, p. 9 speak for themselves. But Mr. C——

“ Drops the Penalty of a conditional Malediction implied in the Word *Alab*.”

And so did the Doctor, p. 36. when arguing against אלה as signifying *execrated*, and had no Design in it.

“ — And says, *Aleim* may be rendered *the Persons bound in a Covenant*.”

He does so, and that very truly: For *Persons bound in a Covenant*, is expressive of the intent, for which Jehovah pronounced the *Alab*; and of the Reason why Men called him *Aleim*, provided, Persons were used to be bound in Covenants under a conditional Malediction.

What follows p. 44. I have read over several Times,

Times, and confess my Stupidity so great, that I cannot understand what the learned Gentleman aims at, and take the blame upon myself, if there be an Argument which I do not pay a proper Respect to. *That the Transaction must be understood as the usual and known Sense of the Word requires*, I understand and readily grant. But I do not see any Reason to grant that the Word according to Mr. C—'s Construction of it, *is not rightly compatible, by his own Account, with God's Nature and Perfections.*

The next is p. 45. that the second Person could not be *Aloab*, in Mr. C—'s Sense of *Alab*,

“ Because the Curse or Execration, implied in, or meant by *Alab*,—is the Penalty of the Breach of the Oath on the Person, who has falsified it.”

That is, because a Person who breaks an Oath is to be *accursed*; therefore no Person who doth not break an Oath can be *accursed*. If **נַּלְנָה** is a Curse, and it was customary, by way of Confirmation of their Covenants to say, Let those be cursed who do not keep them; then *Aleim*, will be, as it is a *personal Noun*, Persons who have so said. And *Aloab* will be, as it is a Part. pass. a Person cursed; one who is *made* or *to be made*, a Curse. The learned Gentleman had not yet, I fear, got a clear Conception of the Sense of *Alab*. And supposing that Mr. C— had not, yet the Sense of it was so obvious in Scripture, in the Passages referred to by the Doctor for the Sense of it, that he might easily have seen that Mr. C—'s general Definition of the Word would comport very well; nay *is just what they meant by the Word.*

But the Doctor thinks, that
“ If we expound **נַּלְנָה** by a Person execrated,
“ we must make *Aleim* (to preserve the Sense of
the Word) to signify something too harsh to be ex-
“ pressed.”

Let

Let us try. *Accursed in the passive*, is a Curser, or Pronoucer of a Curse, in the *Active*. Jehovah says,—*Cursed be he who confirms not all the Words of the Covenant*. Here they bind themselves by this Bann, and nothing *barsh* said or implied: It not being implied that the Curse could fall on Jehovah. And let me repeat it, that tho' to curse, in the *Active*, is to speak the *Words of a Curse*; yet *cursed* is not the Person spoke to, but one who is cursed, or suffers the Curse, which he is not, who is put under the Curse; and if it can be said of the Persons spoke to, that they are they who are brought under or into a Curse; yet we cannot say, they are actually accursed, as Christ was. But I believe, if the Reader will recollect what has been said about *Alab* before, he will easily see through the Confusion that has hatched this, and several other Objections; and which overspreads the long Note, p. 48, 49, and 50. and I hope it now appears that Christ was styled *Alab on another Account*, than being *perjured*, viz. as being made a Curse, the proper Import of the Part. pass. of אלה. And I may now say, in answer to Part of this long Note, p. 49, that in order to find out the Meaning of אלה, we are to look for an אלה which is consequent on the Breach of an Oath, and yet Christ was not named אלה from the Breach of one. Death we find was inflicted on those who despised the *Alab* when pronounced by them who had a right to do it, as in the Case of *Jonathan* and *Saul*; not that *Jonathan* had incurred the Penalty, as *Saul* thought, it seems overhastily; because he had not heard the *Voice of Alab*, as from Common Sense, and the express Words of the Law, *Lev. v. 1.* it was necessary he should have done, before he could be put to Death for it; and which the People could not have rescued him from had he heard it; but though Death was the Penalty of the Breach of an Oath, yet it will not follow that

אָלֹהַ signifies *Death*; or אָלֹהַ one put to *Death*. If we read, *Deut. xxviii. 9.* we find that there were many Particulars contained under the Word אָלֹהַ; and in Consequence of which they were finally to be *cut off*, in *Anger*, and in *Wrath*, and in great *Indignation*. And if *Christ* was *cut off* in *Anger* and in *Wrath*, and which he bore in that last *Agony* in the *Garden*, he was really *Aloab*. And we may thence get the strict Idea of the Word, and see in what Sense he was אָלֹהַ, *viz.* as bearing the *Wrath* of *God*, and being *cut off* from the *Land* of the *Living*. I flatter myself, that if the Doctor will read over the *Examiner* *Examined* again, he will not think the Author was talking so much at *Random*, as he represents him here. Nor is this Word *Aloab* appropriate to *Christ* by its peculiar import and Force, and yet as signifying *accursed*, and applied to one of the Persons of *Jehovah*, it could not mean any other of those Persons but he, who in *Man*, was made a *Curse*. The Notion about a *vicarious Execration*, the learned Doctor dwells so much upon, he has mistaken, I apprehend, from Mr. H——n and Mr. C——. *Aloab* doth not signify a *vicarious Execration*, nor do they ever say so, in order to account for the Meaning of the Word as applied to *Christ*. He would not have been *Aloab*, had it not been necessary for him to be so in our stead, if he would save us; but he was really and in fact made a *Curse*. But I fear it will be thought ill-natured to pursue this Part of the Dispute any further, because it is evident, that if our Construction of *Alab* be right, as I have enlarged upon it here, the Doctor has not been engaged all this Time with Mr. H——n or C—— but pursuing the flying Shadows of his own *Imagination*. And I shall only observe, before I leave it, that as *Christ* is called the *Lamb* slain from the Foundation of the *World*, so long before he was

slai.

flain, he might be called the *execrated*, the *devoted One*, from the same Time or before, because it may answer the Question, Note p. 50. How,

“ הַלְאָ can be expressive of *Christ's Character* “ in that Interval, or even of that one peculiar “ Circumstance of it, his being obliged absolutely “ to be execrated ?”

Because he had sworn he would become a Curse, and *calls things that be not, as though they were*, provided they ever will be.

I proceed now to p. 50.

“ II. Another Objection against Mr. H——n's “ Interpretation of *Aleim*, that *it doth not rightly* “ suit the Word in several of the Uses and Ap- “ plications, that are made of it in Scripture.”

And Mr. C—— it is thought would have withdrawn his Complaint, that *God* is not the Meaning of the *Hebrew Aleim*, had he been at the Trouble of making a trial how the *Hebrew* would run.

Let us be at that Trouble then. Let the Definition be, *Persons who have made a Covenant*, and it signifies so; since it describes the Manner of confirming their Covenants; or if this be objected to, let it be *Denouncers of the Curse*. Only I shall put in a Plea, as we have no *English* Word, to which we have affixed that Idea they by Custom did to *Alab*, for it is, in fact, what the celebrated *Locke* calls a *complex Idea*; or since *to curse* and *Curser* are not used with us, as they were with them, I shall take the Liberty to comment a little, or paraphrase the Word, as the Occasion may seem to require.

First then, p. 51. it is asserted,

“ Where *Aleim* is used for the true God, the “ *Idea of a Trinity of Persons sworn to a Cova-* “ *nant, &c. perhaps in forty-nine Places out of* “ *fifty, makes nothing to the Sense of the Con-* “ *text.*”

Perhaps

Perhaps it may in them all. But suppose the Context did not require that Sense in many Places, what more glorious and tremendous Name could Man call God by, or God call himself by to Man, than *Jehovah Aleim* in *Hebrew*? And it may serve to correct the Notions some People have got, even at this Time of Day, about the Christian Covenant, and shew them that it is *really* a Covenant. And some others may see what a dreadful Curse hangs over their Heads, *though they bless themselves in their Heart, saying, we shall have Peace, though we walk in the Imagination of our Heart*, to give our Thirst its fill, *the Lord will not spare, all the Curses written in this Book, shall lie upon them*. When we are so continually reminded, *in Season and out of Season*, that Jehovah has denounced a Curse *against* all those who are not within his Covenant, which they who seek for Salvation on other Terms are not, we may depend upon it, it is a Matter of more than ordinary Consequence.

“ And where it is not used of the true God, but
“ of Angels,”

“ It is never used for Angels. Mr. H——n has shewn that.

“ ——Or Idols or false Objects of Worship,
“ *this Idea* cannot be carried along with it :”

Nor any that is proper to the true God. Idols and false Objects of Worship, cannot be called *God* in any Sense that Jehovah is so. I am not at all pleased when a Man of Sense talks in a Style below himself, though it may give me an Advantage. Had this Gentleman given himself a Moment’s time to consider, he must have called to Mind, that an *Idol* was only called a *God*, as we call a Picture by the Name of what it represents; and that those who had *false Objects of Worship* thought the same of them, as they who worshipped Jehovah did of him, the true Object. And if the *Israelites* could

could think Jehovah had pronounced a *Bann* in their Favour against all their Opposers, and would support them in the War, against Satan and his Adherents; the Idolaters might think their God thus in League with them; and able and willing to support them. Next,

“ When it is said of false Gods, that they are not *Aleim*, doth it mean only that they have not sworn ? ” p. 52.

It means that they neither have nor can swear; that they neither have laid Mankind under a *Bann*, nor can do so; not being able to perform any thing implied by the Word; not having Authority or Means to denounce a Curse, nor, if their Priests did it in their Name, Power to execute it. If there were two Claimants to the imperial Dignity, both of which denounce the *Bann*, promising to protect and reward those who came over to them, and to destroy those that did not; the natural Question with the People would be, which of the two had the Authority or Right to denounce it, and Power to put it in Execution; and if they should say the *Bann* of him they judged had no just Title, was no *Bann*, the Expression would be proper and intelligible.

“ When it is said, the Lord their *Aleim*, He is *Aleim* of *Aleim*, and Lord of Lords. Although the Word, your *Aleim* might be supposed to have some relation to God’s Oath to *Abraham*, and Covenant with his Seed, yet *Aleim* of *Aleim* cannot import in either of the Words swearing, or covenanting in any Sense.”

But why so? Why may not the latter Word mean *Kings*, as well as *Lords* do so? Jehovah has laid Princes under the Curse, as well as Beggars; the highest as well as the lowest. He is Lord of Lords, and King of Kings; and Denouncer of the Curse on those who denounce it on others.

others. Or, they are under Covenant with God, as their Subjects are with them; and so Subjects themselves as well as their People. A great and important Lesson this; and what the *Pulpit* should proclaim in the Ears of the earthly *Aleim*; both with regard to the spiritual and temporal Concern they have in it.

“ So again, when he is called God of Gods, “ אל אלהים, to construe *Aleim* different from אל would yield *something*, which to common Readers, at least, would prove scarce intelligible.”

If that were all, this might pass among the many other *Somethings*, in the Translations already, scarce intelligible to common or uncommon Readers. But why may not *Al* and *Aleim* be construed differently, as well as *Jehovab* and *Aleim*, when the two Words come together? *Al Aleim* is not, nor can be, always construed God of Gods, see Gen. xxxiii. 20. אל אלהי ישראל. This cannot be God of the Gods of *Israel*.

The *Aleim* of *Abraham*, of the *Hebrews*, &c. seems approved of in our Sense, at least is not condemned, p. 53.

“ Yet when it is joined with Epithets from God’s natural or moral Attributes, as *high*, *eternal*, or *holy Aleim*; or *Aleim of Heaven*; or *Aleim of Hosts*, &c. with such Names of natural Things as are independent on his Covenant with Mankind²; it must surely mean his divine Being, be expressive of his Dominion and Sovereignty, and appear as much the common Name of his Nature, as *Jehovab* is his proper Name.”

I suppose there is a Difference betwixt the Name of God’s Nature, and his proper Name, though such a common Reader as I am cannot find it out. But let us try to construe these Expressions; the *Holy*, the *high* *Ones*, who have denounced the Curse,

² Though nothing is so.

or, who are under Oath with us. These Epithets seem to comport with *Aleim* well enough.

Aleim of Heaven, those who are in Heaven, of or belonging to Heaven: Whose dwelling is not with Flesh and Blood; as *Aleim of Sepervain, Hena, and Iva*, were the *Aleim* in or of those Places. Our *Litany* says, *God the Father of Heaven*: And our Lord, *Our Father which art in Heaven*. *Rabab* says to the Spies, *Your Aleim, He is Aleim in Heaven above.*

Aleim of Hosts. If *Hosts* means *Armies*, the Armies of Israel in many Places; or the *Hosts of the Nations*, *Jer. iii. 19.* the Sense is obvious and proper, as before explained. If *Hosts* means *the Heavens*, I need not repeat what is just said, or it may be understood, as God is called *Jehovah of Hosts*, he whose Jurisdiction, or under whose Power, or whose Property, whatever is called *Hosts*, most certainly is. And this was the grand Point betwixt Israel and Mankind, whose God had denounced the Curse, and had the Power in Heaven and Earth; and so was He who could make good what the Word imported, and these Epithets, with such Names of natural Things as have the natural Power in them, determine the Point, that those who were under Oath with *Abraham*, (and were so with *Adam*) were the *only Aleim*; the only Persons who had Authority to *denounce the Curse*, or Power to put it in Execution; Kings were their Delegates, and are called *Aleim*, as their Representatives. The Heathen Gods were falsely so called; so there was none in Heaven above or the Earth beneath, but *Jehovah* to whom this Title could belong.

One would hardly have thought of an Objection from the Epithets with the Word, when the whole Dispute was for so many Years, whether there were any Persons in Heaven who were *supreme*; or whether the Heavens themselves were *supreme*. And the

Purport and Design of this *Alah* was that all Mankind should acknowledge there were no other but Jehovah. *Aleim* high, holy, eternal only, *Aleim* of Heaven, of Hosts, and the like, are Claims of Priority, Superiority, Sovereignty, and Dominion belonging to the *Aleim* which they worshipped, or whose *Bann* they feared. The Word **רַבָּה** used for God, Gen. xxxi. 42, and 53. the Dread of *Isaac*, expresses something not less harsh, than the *Exercrator* whom *Isaac* worshipped and acknowledged for supreme.

If *high, holy, eternal, in Heaven, of Heaven, be thought* improper Epithets with the true *Aleim*, because there are none holy, high or in Heaven but themselves ; I suppose that *Aleim* of Vengeance, of Salvation, and such Attributes to them, will be allowed to be proper, because they are implied in *Aleim*. Vengeance on Enemies and Safety to Friends, as Isai. xxxv. 4. *Say ye to them of a fearful Heart, be strong, fear not: behold your Aleim will come with Vengeance; with Recompence shall the Aleim himself come, and save you.* Where the double Import of the *Bann*, they take the Name from, is fully expressed ; they being bound by it to support the Weak, and save them ; turning the Curse or Vengeance on the Enemy. The *Banner* was the Sign of the *Bann*, in Consequence of which the War began ; and so those who come under Christ's *Banner*, condemn Satan and his Adherents ; and acknowledge that the Curse of God lays on Mankind, till cut off from them in him. They acknowledge the Sentence just, and fly from the Wrath to come ; and fly for Refuge to the Terms assured to us by a Curse pronounced on all who do not seek for Shelter there from the Wrath to come.

The next Objection is, that

“ Mat. xxii. 32. and Act. vii. 32. we find **אֱלֹהִים** rendered by *Ως* : and it must not be said “ *here,*

“ bere, that *this is nothing to the Meaning of the Hebrew brew.*”

But why this must not be said, is not so clearly made out, as Mr. C—— is gently sneered for his Expression. However I shall venture to say, that *this Θεος bere* is nothing more to the Meaning of the Hebrew than Θεος elsewhere; or Θεος any Thing at all, as far as I know, to the Meaning of *Aleim*, i.e. the Words have not the same Idea or Meaning. If they had, it would be proper for the Doctor to shew it; and when he has done so, Mr. C——’s Exception shall be withdrawn; till he has done so, it may stand. If he doth know what Θεος meant, as he owns he doth not know what *Aleim* did, then for aught that appears to the contrary, what Mr. C—— says may be true. I think the Doctor leaves us in Possession of this Part of the Argument. He refers to the *Remarks on the Observation*, p, 54. and *Examiner examined*, p. 36. and says,

“ I am obliged for *Brevity’s Sake* not to enter “ into this Part of the Dispute here.”

Whether it be for *Brevity’s Sake* alone, or some other more manifest Reason, let the Reader, after looking at the *Remarks* and *Examiner examined*, judge for himself. However the Doctor does yield the Point to us for the present, that it was not prudent in the *Evangelists* to correct the LXX tho’ faulty in this, as well as in a great Number of other Particulars. But,

“ St. Paul, Heb. xi. 16. Speaking of the Patriarchs, says, that on account of their Faith, “ God was not ashamed to be called their God. Now “ this is not a Quotation from the LXX.”

What is it a Quotation from then? Not from the *Hebrew*, for there it is אלהים and not Θεος. The LXX do on this very Occasion, and always where they thought *Aleim* spoke of the true God, translate it by Θεος. It is indeed,

“ A Reference of the Apostle himself to the Reason
“ why God took on him the Title of the God of
Abraham, &c.”

But that Title was already in the publickly approved or allowed of Translation Θεος of *Abraham*; and if it was not *prudent* in the Apostle to correct that Translation, he could not translate *Aleim* of *Abraham*, or their *Aleim* more *correctly* without Impropriety. I shall readily allow that St. *Paul* was the Author of this *Epistle*, and wrote it in the *Greek*. St. *Paul* was no less inspired than St. *Matthew*; and if it was imprudent in St. *Matthew* to correct the received Translation of *Aleim*, it must be the same in St. *Paul* to do it. And therefore I see not why the Doctor should say, that,

“ This is independant on the said Dispute,” or why he shou’d peremptorily say,

“ Now this (viz. Θεος *Heb.* 11. 16.) is not a Quotation from the LXX.” and I say, Now this is a Quotation from thence, tho’ the whole Sentence is not, as far as our Dispute is concerned. Θεος was the common Word in *Greek* for *Aleim*; they had no other Word for it; and the Apostles did not think it proper to form a new one. Nor could they form a more plain, full and comprehensive one than *Aleim*, to which they refer us, when they cite and refer to the Scriptures, tho’ they write *Greek*, when they are writing in *Greek*.

Let us consider the Sense of Θεος in this Quotation and Argument of the Doctor’s. *Heb.* 11. 16.—On account of the Faith of *Abraham*, God was not ashamed to be called his God.—What Sense will you put on the word *God* here? Not the heathen Sense to be sure; their Gods were not the true God. Shall we take the Doctor’s Sense, as expressive of God’s Dominion and Sovereignty, and as the common Name of his Nature? p. 53. This Sense cannot have a place here, for God’s Nature and Dominion is the same

same, whether *Abraham* acknowledged it or no. Nor could God be *Creator* on the account of his *Faith*; nor *Judge* on that account, for he will judge Believers and Unbelievers both. It cannot be spoke in any Sense which doth not come under *Aleim* in *Hebrew*, to make the Apostle's Argument Sense, or conclusive. The Faith of *Abraham* made him stand in the relation to God, as a Subject resorting to the Banner of his King, on War proclaimed against an Enemy, does; as Persons bound to each other, in League together; and so entitled to the Protection of his King against the Enemy; and this Quotation of the Doctor's is a pretty clear Proof that *Aleim* doth not signify the *Nature* of God, but is expressive of some *Relation*, *Connection*, or some *Contract* in behalf of those who should put their Trust in him. Let the Reader weigh well this Text, and consider the Force of the Apostle's Reasoning, and I fancy he will think with me it was very *incautiously* brought against our Sense of *Aleim*. And I am sorry to see so much Pains taken to support a Difference betwixt the Prophets and Apostles; or else betwixt the inspired Writers, and our common Sense. For either the Apostles did not design Θεος for a Translation of *Aleim* but a Reference to it, or they have open'd a Dispute not to be ended, whether we are to look on *Aleim* as a *Singular*, or *God* as a *Plural*; or a *Singular* and *Plural* to be the same.

The Defender of Mr. H—n's Plan leaves this Question for the *moderate Apologist* to reflect on, "That since אלהים is plural, and Θεος singular, whether he doth not give judgment against the Evangelists, who translate the one by the other, as well as translate both Jehovah and Adoni by οὐρανος." The Note, p. 55. remarks upon this, "Should the *Apologist* reply, that the *Evangelists*, in rendering אלהים by Θεος, have given judgment against taking *Aleim* in a plural Sense, tho'

“ it have a plural Termination, it might sufficiently
 “ obviate this Part of the Objection in the manner it
 “ is put.”

If I am to take this as Dr. Sharp's Remark ; I answer, it is contrary to the Concession in the preceding Page, that it was not prudent in the Evangelists to correct the LXX, and therefore they gave no Judgment about the matter ; and it is entering into a Dispute he there thought proper to decline ; and repeating an Objection without taking any notice of the Answer, which himself refers to. If I am to look on this, as indeed I am apt to do, as coming from the Apologist himself, because it is much of a piece with that Performance, I say, it would have made his Note but a little longer, had he made some Apology, or asked Pardon for that Piece of Nonsense, and the Ridicule for it, he endeavoured to fasten on Mr. H——n for the Translation of the first Verse of Genesis, and some other things in that Piece ; but in answer to his Reply, I say, that he who makes the Apostles give judgment against taking אלהים in a plural Sense, makes the Prophets give judgment against taking Θεος in a singular. The Authority of the Prophets and Apostles is equal : The Holy Ghost inspired them all, and is the Author of both Testaments, They are but the Scribes. The Learned are as much agreed that אלהים is plural, as they are that Θεος is singular. And when some People have been as long conversant in Hebrew, as they have in Greek, they will find Hebrew as intelligible as Greek, and perhaps a great deal more so. But can any Authority whatever convince a Man that Θεος is not plural, and to be taken in a plural Sense ? And is not אלהים translated by Θεος in the New Testament ? Do not the plural Nouns, Participles, and Verbs with Aleim in Hebrew prove it has a plural Sense as well as Termination ? The Reply, that though it be plural it may not have a plural Signification, most certainly

came from one who did not know what he was talking about, and therefore I believe I have ascribed it to its right Author.

The Definition of *κύριος* that follows from *κύρος*, *He that alone has Authority and Power*; and the other from *κύρω* to exist, may comport well enough with *Jebovah* either of them; but neither of them with אֱלֹהִים, for אֱלֹהִים is not *be that alone has Authority and Power*; and if you leave out *alone*, and make it *be that has Power*, it doth not come up to, or express the Idea, in *Jebovah*, which is the *incommutable Name* of God, whereas אֱלֹהִים is common to his Creatures. And I presume I might desire to know by what Rules in the Greek Tongue *κύριος* is to be fetched from *κύρος* rather than *κύρω*, or, *vice versa*; and since it makes so great a Difference, which of them it comes from, how it can come from them both? unless it has the privilege of Hebrew Names, to own more Fathers than one. If I might presume to do it, without Offence, it wou'd be to desire the Doctor to look at this Question once more, as it stands *Answer to Moderate Apolog.* p. 101. But,

“ III. If we would have an Eye to the Majesty of the Divine Nature,—It would seem far more reasonable to deduce אלהּ to swear, and אלהּ an Oath, from אלהּ and אלהּ God.” p. 56.

If אלהּ to swear, be borrowed from אלהּ God, then God and Swearer will come from the same Root, and so the Note says it doth in Arabic, which is giving up the main Part of the Dispute. So it that here the Doctor falls in with the H—ns; only chuses, from *an Eye to the divine Majesty*, to name God first in the Construction of the Word; but agrees directly with us, that they are the same in Word; and since אלהּ amongst Men does signify a Swearer to a Covenant, we have the same Reason to conclude it signifies so as a Name of God, as

the Doctor just now concluded upon, that *κύριος* was *κύρων*, because *κύρων* is to exist. Have not all Words the same Signification when applied to God as when used for Men, making proper Allowances? How else would Descriptions of what God *is*, *did*, or *said*, be intelligible? Indeed I look upon this *new invented Derivation*, as giving up the Dispute, and unawares allowing that the Words are the same: And then the Signification must be the same, unless the inspired Writers had a mind to deceive us, and make this a *single Exception* to a general Rule, that the same Words applied to God or Man mean the same Thing. The Word *God* cannot be supposed an *arbitrary unmeaning Word*, and thence made to signify an *Oath* or *Curse*; or to signify *God's Nature* and *Sovereignty*, and thence applied to an *Oath*; because neither his *Nature* nor *Dominion* consist in swearing or cursing; and then the Word would have had another Idea fixed to it, which would be only confounded by giving it another still. If they who first applied it to God meant *nothing* by it, they were talking like Parrots. If they meant *something* by it, they must take the Idea of that *something* from Things below, Actions, or, &c. amongst ourselves, because we are limited to Sense for all our Ideas.

The Difference of an *Oath*, from an *Affeveration*, consists, the Doctor argues, in an Appeal to God, and taking him to record. But he that swears takes not the Nature of God, nor his Sovereignty, nor Dominion upon himself: He cannot be said to become a God in any Sense, by an Appeal to him, or making him his Surety or Bondsman.

It is the *only* social and common Action of human Life, in which Man makes God a Party with himself, or *assumes God into his Action*— A new Species of *Transubstantiation*, or changing God into an Action.

“ — Except this may be said also of a Curse.”
And why not of *Blessing* too?

The following Inference from the above *new invented*, or rather *inverted* Derivation, which the Author seems to grow fonder and fonder of, as he enlarges upon it, p. 57.

“ If then the Nature of an Oath be derived from
“ his Being, what wonder if the *Name of an Oath*
“ be derived from his Name and Title,”

May be strong Reasoning; though, and I am sorry for my Incapacity, I cannot see any Sense in the Words, or collect what *deriving an Oath from God's Being can mean*. If it means from a Word expressive of *God's Being*, then it ought to have been derived from *Jehovah*, for that is the Word expressive of *God's Being*; see p. 55. of the learned Work before us. I should think there is no Comparison betwixt the *Nature of an Oath*, and *God's Being* and *Nature*. There doth not seem any Possibility even of imagining any Likeness. And tho' I do not presume to think, that Dr. Sharp can use a Parcel of Words without any Meaning to them, yet I should have looked on the most Part of what he hath been pleased to say, in treating of this inverted Etymology in that View, had I found it in a Writer of a less eminent Class, whose Work had been the Produce of Haste or Passion; or who had no learned Friends to shew him the *Way of amending* what might have been judged amiss, or less correct. And I am apt to think, the Doctor would have withdrawn his Etymology, if he had been at the Trouble of making a Trial, how the Sense would run, if *God* were substituted instead of *Oath* or *Curse*, as he would have it. To take an Oath, would be *to take a God*. To Curse a Person, to *God him*. To break an Oath, to *break a God*. A prophane Oath, a *prophane God*. To swear a Man, to *God him*. A prophane Swearer, a *prophane Godder*. But as the Doctor

does not mean any more, p. 60. by all this Supposition, than only to try how far it would weigh against Mr. C——'s Assertion, I shall drop it too, as what seems to weigh too light to deserve to be put into the Scales.

The last, and a very material Objection it seems it is, is still behind, and it is this:

“ That the Passages which are brought from Scripture to reconcile us to the Idea, which the Word Aleim according to Mr. C—— conveys, do not at all answer the End, for which they are cited.”

What End did Mr. C—— bring them for? Why to reconcile us to the Idea of Aleim, as signifying Persons bound in Covenant, or, under Oath with their Subjects.

But says the Doctor,

“ When he produces, Gen. xxii. 16. By myself have I sworn, that in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed, to prove that Aleim had sworn, who had (as he says, p. 9.) before the Action of Creation performed an Act which denominated them Aleim.—When he produces this Text, as referring to that original Oath and Contract, he seems to have overlooked all those Texts following in the Bible.—The Question lies here, whether God did swear to Abram—and confirm now by Oath, what he had only promised to him before; or whether God only gave him to understand what had been concluded upon, and sworn to by the Aleim, before the Foundation of the World.” p. 62.

Turn to the Sermon, p. 9. and you will see that Mr. C——'s Argument to prove that those Persons who created the World had before that performed an Act which denominated them Aleim, is from its being said, the Aleim created; which implies that they were Aleim when they created;

and it does so, as much as calling them *Creators* implies they were so, when so called. But Mr. C— doth not bring Gen. xxii. 16. to prove that they had sworn before the Creation; but to reconcile us to the Idea of God's swearing: To prove that the *Aleim* swore, he says, *Serm. p. 10.* The second Part of the Covenant was, that in case Man fell, they would put him into a Method of Salvation.—To prove this; 1. The *Aleim* swore. This their Name shews; but further, *Hab. i. 12.* *Art not thou מֶלֶךְ מִן־הָרִאשׁוֹת from the first, &c.* *Jehovab Alei*, he who was bound by Oath to redeem me? So in the Manifestations to the Patriarchs, in *Consequence and Reference to the original Contract*, Gen. xxii. 16. *By myself have I sworn*,—and p. 11. The Texts already quoted in relation to the promised Seed shew this (viz. *that they swore to save Man*) in part. Those Texts then, in relation to the promised Seed, were only cited to shew, in part, that God swore to save Man. They were cited as he says, p. 10. to prove that the *Aleim* swore. This was the Part they were brought for, not to prove that the Oath was from Eternity. There are, as he divides them, three Things to be proved,

1. That the *Aleim* swore, *p. 10.*
2. That they swore to put Man into a State of Salvation, *p. 11.*
3. That they swore to save Man, *p. 11.*

Under the first Head, he produces the Texts that relate to the promised Seed, Gen. xxii. 16. *Psal. lxxxix. 3, 4. and cx. 5.* So the Doctor states the Question wrong, when he says,

“ The Question lies here, Whether God did swear to Abraham now, or, &c.”

He supports his Inference upon Mr. C——'s saying, *Son* (viz. the Aleim swore,) *in the Manifestations to the Patriarchs, in Consequence and Reference to the original Contract.* Most certainly the Oath to *Abraham* was not the original Contract to save Man; the Doctor will not say it was; though he says it was the first Oath of God to that Purpose: Therefore this Oath to *Abraham* was in *Consequence* of the original Contract. The Covenant with *Abraham* was a *Renewal* of the original Covenant, it could be no more, unless there was no Covenant before, *for, with, or in* the Behalf of Man. But *there is not a Word* in Mr. C—— that he thought the Aleim did not swear to *Abraham* in Person.

The Doctor next sets himself to prove, that *an Oath was made to Abraham in Person*; a Trouble, it seems, he might have saved himself, and here, in a Note, p. 64. He quotes the *Remarks* —
 “ Mr. H——n says, — *This Covenant and Oath was but once made, but is often referred to by this Verb and Noun, viz. אלה.*” Mr. H——n says true. The Covenant of Grace made between the Aleim was prior to the *Foundation of the World*, as we see in the *New Testament*, and could not have been made either with *Abraham* or any other Man; no Creature could be a Party there, had there been any it was to concern then in Being. The Oath to *Abraham*, though actually made, was not this Oath or Covenant. Nor was the *Promise* to *Abraham*, Gen. xii. (and which was *formally* confirmed to him, Chap. xv. by cutting off a *Berith*) with an *Alab* pronounced, *I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee, and in thee shall all the Families of the Earth be blessed*, this, I say, was not the original Promise to Man. It was preaching the *Gospel* to *Abraham*; but was not the original Declaration, that Mankind should be blessed in *Christ*, and in him only. Mr. H——n says, “ If

“ every

“ every Exhibition of this *Purification* had been a
 “ Covenant, the References to them must often
 “ have been plural, which is never found. The
 “ Benefits that accrue by that Covenant to Man,
 “ are expressed by the Promise, *Gen. iii. 15. Her
 “ Seed, it shall bruise thy Head.* So to a Family, *In
 “ thee shall all the Families of the Earth be blessed,
 “ &c.*” *Trinity of the Gentiles*, p. 380. and cites all
 the Texts which refer to the Oath made to *Abra-
 ham*. He is so far from denying an Oath, or Pro-
 mize, or Covenant with *Abraham*, that he says, *it
 was an Exhibition of the Original*, and Mr. C——
 says, *it was in Consequence of it*, which it could not
 have been, had it not been really made. So that
 I cannot easily see what it was which led this inge-
 nuous and candid Adversary into this Mistake about
 the Oath to *Abraham*.

The Doctor sets himself to convince them of
 this Mistake of his own making, p. 62. and enters
 a Caveat against their taking the Advantage of the
 Translation, which renders

“ The original Word יִשְׁבַּרְתִּי, in the *perfect*
 “ Tense, *I have sworn*, when it might have been
 “ as justly rendered in the present Tense, *I swear*:
 “ and which is really the most natural rendering.”

But they have offered at no such Advantage,
 which this laboured Confutation seems to suppose.
 Nor would it have been any Advantage to them had
 they done so. *I have sworn to Abraham*, as much
 asserts an Oath actually made to *Abraham*, as *I now
 swear to Abraham* does. If the Reader recollect
 what passed betwixt God and *Abraham*, Chap. xv.
 before *Isaac* was born, he will be inclinable per-
 haps to think, that the Translators have not mis-
 taken the *Tense*, Chap. xxii. 16. referring here to
 that solemn Contract made there with *Abraham* on
 account of his Faith, which he had now given an
 heroic Proof of in the offering up of his Son. Be
 that

that as it will, whether נשבעה be construed in this last and the following Places, *I have sworn*, or, *I swear*, so largely insisted upon for eight or ten Pages together, matters not one Jot to the Question this learned Gentleman has taken so much Pains to discuss, and in which he has no Adversary that I know of. Nor do I see any Reason to think it ever entered the Head of Mr. H——n or C—— that it made any Difference which *Tense* you render it in. However, *they lay no Stress*, as they had no occasion to do, on any such Difference.

But the Doctor will have it, p. 69. that
 “ It was *prudent* in Mr. C—— not to proceed
 “ further in his Citations of this kind, because
 “ נשבעה, in the next Text he must have quoted,
 “ had he proceeded, *viz. Jer. xxii. 5.* is translated,
 “ as is most natural in that Place, *I swear.*”

This is not altogether so *prudently* said, or so wholly in that Spirit of Ingenuity and Candour the Reader had reason to expect from a Person of Dr. Sharp’s Character: It being an Attempt to fix a Piece of Insincerity on the Dead, without the least Ground or scarce Shadow of Pretence for it.

If Mr. C—— *prudently* stopt short, lest the next Citation to be made should betray the Weakness of his Argument, by the Word being in the *present Tense* there, one would suppose, he had laid some Stress upon the different Translation in the other Places; and that *he knew* he was wrong in so doing; and was knowingly putting a Fallacy upon his less knowing Readers, without thinking that the Learned could so easily expose it; why else was it *prudent* in him not to proceed further? Which I think is *making* him (it is not *calling* him) both Knavery and Fool. It is base and disingenuous in any Writer surely to design to deceive his Readers, and knowingly impose a Falshood upon them. But I may be mistaken in my Judgment of this Observation

servation on Mr. C——'s *Prudence*, because the
" Doctor says, *Pref. p. 18.*

" I am not conscious that I have made one per-
sonal Reflection upon him, but have treated him
with all *due* Respect and Decency."

So either the above is no *Reflection* upon Mr. C—— or it is his *due*, or the Doctor may be con-
scious to himself now of what he was not then. The
grave and decent Word *prudent* is spoke in Temper
and Sobriety, but might be attended with a Look
in the true Spirit of Controversy.

I would not insinuate that the Mistake was de-
signedly made for the Sake of exposing Mr. H——
and C—— but it is a Misapprehension of their
Meaning like that so often rhetorically flourished
upon, and which we meet with again, thrust in
and seemingly out of Place, in the midst of this,
which is another Dispute, at p. 66.

" For the Persons of the Godhead to swear by
" themselves to themselves, is a Construction, and
" gives an Idea the Mind cannot rest in."

The Mind need not rest in it. They swore not
for their own Sakes, but ours ; to assure us, not
themselves. They made the Covenant, or concerted
the Counsel of Salvation between themselves ; and
swore to *perform it* ; if not when they made the
Covenant ; at least when they admitted Man into it.
So that most of what is objected to our Construc-
tion of *Alein* falls upon that Position only. And
the Texts the Sermon produces will reconcile us to
the Idea, the Word according to it conveys ; and
do answer the End for which they are cited. Some
of our Adversaries have not reached the Merits of
the Cause, but I fear this learned Gentleman has
over-reached himself, in attempting to come at
them.

But tho' the Texts so largely and learnedly criti-
cised upon by the Doctor, p. 62. *et seq.* certainly
re-

refer to an Oath made by God to *Abraham* in Person, yet they all suppose a prior Covenant in favour of Man, and make that and the Oath to *Abraham* to be the same in Substance, and would lead one to think that the *Original* was confirmed by Oath, as well as the *Copy*; thus *Luke* 1. 68. *et seq.* *Hath raised up a Horn of Salvation for us — as be spake by the mouth of the Holy Prophets, which have been since the World began, — to perform the mercy promised to our Fathers, and to remember his Holy Covenant: The Oath which he sware to our Father Abraham.* And *Heb.* 6. 13. *When God made promise to Abraham, — He sware by himself. — So after he had patiently endured, he obtained the Promise. — God willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of the Promise, the Immutability of his Counsel, confirmed it by an Oath, that — we might have a strong Consolation, — who have fled for Refuge to lay hold upon the Hope set before us.* Here the general Hope of all Believers is said to be confirmed by Oath; and the Argument is, that we should trust to the Oath of God for it, and patiently endure, as *Abraham* did upon the Oath to him, and receive the Promise likewise. These Texts make the Covenant of God with Man, and the Hope they have had of Salvation since the World began, the same with the Oath to, and Hope of *Abraham*; and as that Covenant was made before the World, and the Hope was given to the first Man, we from these Texts may fairly collect that the Covenant of God was confirmed by Oath when first made; and that it was made known to *Adam*, as soon as he had occasion to know it, which was when the Conquest of *Satan* and his Adherents was first promised him in the Seed of the Woman. By the Covenant, *Jehovah* is *Aleim*, or has denounced a Curse on all who do not keep it. And we may justly look for the Date of the *Alab* in the Covenant, of which it was so material a Part. But I believe I need

not spend many more Words on this Head ; the true Notion of the Covenant of Grace, and direct Meaning of אלהָן and Intent of denouncing it, will set all these Altercations aside.

And tho' a Proof from יְשַׁבֵּן, that God has sworn several times since " the Creation, is no proof that " he is stiled *Aleim* from having sworn before the " Creation, p. 70." Yet it will reconcile us to the Idea or Meaning of *Aleim*, when applied to God, as Persons who have denounced a Curse, and bound themselves to Man, and Man to themselves under the Penalty of it, or that have laid themselves and us under an Oath to confirm all the Words of the Law to do them : Because whether it was in Time or before Time that they did it, their really having done so takes off all that Repugnancy to our natural Ideas of God, which this low Condescension seems to carry along with it. And there seems to be further Reason to suppose the *Alah* was pronounced when the Covenant was made, besides the Custom of ratifying Covenants by it, that though Man was not then in Being, yet the Enemy of Man was. He or they against whom the War, the Bann was denounced, as Promoters and chief Abettors of the Rebellion, who made it necessary for Jehovah to become *Aleim*, to join with Man in the War, were then in Being.

The Doctor began his Enquiry into the true Import of the Noun אלהָן, with laying down a Distinction betwixt it and שבעה, an *Oath*, which I gave the Examination of the other Word the Preference to ; and shall now enquire into the true Import of

שְׁבָעָה.

I make no doubt but that these two Words do differ in their original Sense, or radical Meaning, they are so widely different in their radical Letters. And tho' I think, they are used indifferently in Scripture to signify the same thing, yet I have the Pleasure of agreeing with the Doctor, that

" There

“ There is ground for presuming, that they are not synonymous Terms.” p. 24. But I cannot agree with him, that the difference between them is, that

“ אלה is a Curse denounced upon others ; שבעה an Imprecation of Evil upon one’s self.” p. 25.

The manner of giving and taking an Oath, was as we have seen by the Magistrate’s *denouncing a Curse*, and the Subjects saying *Amen* to it. So that Subjects did not imprecate Evil upon themselves, but only assented to that which was imprecated upon them by those who were their lawful Superiors. And I apprehend the Instance of Numb. v. 22. doth not support this Distinction, but indeed destroys it ; for this plain Reason, because the Woman did not imprecate the Evil on herself, but only assented to the Imprecation of the High-Priest. She only said, *Amen, Amen.* There is nothing in the Context to lead one to confine שבעה to the Application the Woman makes of the Imprecation of the High-Priest to herself, or any other Reason, than the *supposed* Distinction above, assigned by the Doctor for it ; nothing in the radical Meaning of the two Words for it, and therefore it seems no more than an *arbitrary Supposition*, *Let that befall Thee, which befel such an one*, the Doctors calls an אלה, and *Let that befall me which befel such an one*, שבעה. One would think they need not have gone such a round-about way to express a Difference betwixt *Thee* and *Me*, which are no Part of the *Verb* or *Noun*, when the Pronouns being changed would have done it. But the Distinction aimed at will not hold, because a Curse denounced on others was to *them* an Oath. And the common People did not imprecate Evil on *themselves*, but only assented to that which was imprecated upon them by the Magistrate ; and in the Case of bearing *Evidence* were bound by it, whether they would or no ; and were equally guilty, for not speaking the Truth after

after they had heard the Voice of the *Alah*, as if they bore false Evidence ; however were to bear their *Iniquity* for barely being silent ; see *Lev. v. 1.* But there are so many Places where this Word is used for the same thing as **לֹא**, *viz.* for the Act of him who denounced a Curse on others, whether as Verb or Noun, that the Doctor's Distinction cannot stand upon the Usage of the Words, any more than it will be found to do upon the precise Meaning of them. *Gen. xxiv. 3, 8 and 37.* *Abraham* made his Servant to *swear*. And this is twice called **לֹא** ver. 41. *Jacob* swears *Joseph*. *Gen. xlvii. 29.* Put I pray thee thy Hand under my Thigh, (as *Abraham* made his Servant do when he gave him his Oath.) ver. 31. *He said swear unto me.* Chap. 1. 5. *My Father made me swear.* ver. 25. *Joseph* **שָׁבַע** swore the Children of *Israel*. *Exod. xiii. 19.* *Joseph* had strictly sworn the Children of *Israel*. I suppose it will be hardly disputed but that *Joseph* gave the Oath, as we call it, to the Children of *Israel*, as *Jacob* to him, which was done by his pronouncing the Curse, as in other such Cases ; and is expressly said in the Case of *Abraham*'s giving his Servant his Oath, by calling it an *Alah*, *Exod. xxii. 11.* *The Oath of the Lord shall be between them both.* This was the **לֹא**, or Curse pronounced by the High-Priest between them, to which *Lev. v. 1.* &c. refer. *Numb. v. 19.* *The Priest shall swear* ber ; ver. 21. *shall swear her* **בְּשָׁבֻעַת חָלָח**. *Josh. vi. 26.* *Joshua* **שָׁבַע** swore at that Time saying, Cursed be the Man before the Lord that, &c. Here *Joshua* denouncing the Curse on others is said, to swear, and so *Deut. xxvii. 14.* The Curse denounced by the Levites on all the People is by *Corn. à Lapide* construed, the **שָׁבַע** mentioned *Dan. ix. 11.* and consequently **שָׁבַעַת** is an Imprecation on others, according to this great Critick, who had no turn to serve by his Remark, the same that **לֹא** is. And here I

must

must do the Doctor the Justice to acknowledge his open and ingenuous Temper in not suppressing so great an Authority as that of *Corn. à Lapide*, tho' it destroys the Distinction between the two Words he is so sedulous to maintain. I might refer to other Places, but I think these are sufficient to shew that the Doctor seems to have taken up this Notion too much upon trust, and to have thought his Evidence wou'd have proved more than it does.

It is commonly supposed, and by the Usage of the Words it appears that אלה and שבעה are indifferently in Scripture applied to the same thing, but are not synonymous Terms.

If שׁבַע have but one meaning or *Idea* belonging to it, an Oath must some how or other signify *full*, *perfect*, *compleat*, *sufficient*, which is the judicious Leigh's Construction of the Word in his *Crit. Sacr.* and which is the Sense given the Word by *Lexicographers* in general ; and the Usage of it in Scripture shews it is rightly construed. Leigh says, formerly there was not that Difference in שׁבַע as now there is ; and says that this Word which signifies to swear, signifies also to satisfy, *He to whom we swear must be therewithal contented.* Bish. Andrews in his *Cat.* But this will not do when it is used, as it so often is, in the *passive Voice* and נשבעת which is passive, would mean that the Person who swears, and not *He to whom he swears*, is satisfied. If *compleat*, *perfect*, *sufficient*, be the Meaning of the Word ; in the *Passive*, it is one made perfect, compleat, sufficient. When we take a Security of a Person for the Performance of a *Promise*, or *Contract*, or would make the *Evidence* of a Witness *legal*, we do it by Oath. And requiring a *Security*, *Bond* or *Pledge* to make the Person sufficient, or fit to be trusted or relied on, supposes we think that there is, as on many accounts there undoubtedly is, a *Defect* in a bare Word, *Promise* or *Assveration.* By an Oath this *Defect* is sup-

supplied. The Party pledges his Hopes in God, and God, as it were his *Bondsman*, to perform for him, or revenge the Treachery. So a Person sworn is one made *compleat*, has the Defect in him supplied; is *made sufficient* to be trusted, as sufficient as he can be made. A Mortgage is a Security for a Loan of Money; and the Hopes of Heaven pledged, or the Curse of God denounced, a Security on the Person who swears, who is thereby made *a good sufficient Man*. To swear by the Lord then, is to be made *sufficient, compleat*, by the Lord. He being (if I may form a Word, like *Mort-gage*) *False-Gage*, or bound to give Satisfaction in case of Falsehood or Treachery. And the Person who takes the Oath is also fully or sufficiently enabled, or qualified, to be accepted. When it is used in *Hipbil*, as *Gen. 24. 3.* אַשְׁבֵּעַ *I will cause thee to swear*, is, I will cause thee to give Security, Satisfaction, in or on Jehovah, that thou, &c. And when Jehovah, in Condescension to us, says, 'בָּנְשָׁבָעָתִי, By myself I am made sufficient', it is I have given such a Security, as shews I may be trusted. I have pledged myself, my Life, calling my own Attributes to witness to my Promise. There can require no Security to supply any Defect, or Insufficiency in God's Promise; but in *Law*, the *Complement* of an Oath is requisite, and therefore given even by God himself.

If אלה be a Curse, שבעת האלה will be, the Security given by denouncing a Curse, and shew us the difference betwixt the two Words, and, the Lord make thee לאלה that which was denounced on thee, and לשבעה the Security taken on thee, *Numb. v. 21.* will be a Repetition to enforce the Awe upon her Mind that she was under a Curse; but will not confound the separate Ideas in the two Words, *Numb. xxx. 14.* שבעת אטר, The *Obligation* of the Bond seems more intelligible, than the *Oath of the Bond*. אלה is the Curse, or Wrath of God following

the proper Objects of it, and *eating as doth a Canker*; *Isai. xxiv. 6.* “the Curse has devoured the Land.” We may apply here what *Job* says, *xx. 28.* *The Increase of his House shall depart, and his Good flow away in the Day of his Wrath*—A Wasting away or Consumption upon them and all that they have: אָרוֹן from אָרַר to flow, is flowed away. Such a Wasting away or Curse was to be upon the *Israelites* and every Thing belonging to them, when they should break the Oath, or incur the *Alab* denounced; *they were to be destroyed and brought to nought*, see *Deut. xxviii. 63.* And every Particular the Wrath of God could affect them in, is mentioned at large on the solemn Denuntiation of the Curse, *Deut. xxviii. 10.* and following Chapter, and is called at once Chap. *xxix. 20.* *כָּל הָאֱלֹהִים* the whole Curse; *Jer. xxviii. 10.* “because of the Curse the Land mourneth.” The Imprecation of such (Ch. *xxviii. 22.*) a *Consumption*, was the most awful, and solemn manner of administering an Oath; and laid the strongest Tie upon the Mind, and might well be called, שְׁבֻעָה, Satisfaction or Security; or (to form another Word) the being *securitied*, enabled with a sufficient Security.

It hath been a Question why God should take a Name from אלה rather than נשׁבע. Mr. *B*—d put the Question first, and Dr. *Sharp* follows him in it. *p. 77, 78.*

“ Why אלה, if it doth signify to swear, should be used rather than נשׁבע for the expressing God’s Name :”

And asserts, as Mr. *Bedford* did, that

“ The latter only is used to express his act of Swearing, throughout the Scripture :”

The contrary of which we have seen; and the Supposition of which both these learned Authors were led into from not rightly apprehending the meaning of *Alab*, Curse pronounced, which was the first and original Oath; and is strictly only what we mean

mean by *an Oath* ; נשבע is only a Reference to some prior Act, or some other Act, which gave Satisfaction, Assurance, or sufficient Credit. The Act to which it refers in Scripture, when spoke of God, is the *Alab* of the Covenant ; which, (by making the Covenant) God denounced or laid on all Mankind. God did not say, *I swear to perform all the Words of the Law*, but *Cursed is every one who doth not* ; which bound all Parties. *Abimeleck* says to *Isaac*, *let there be an Alab*, Curse pronounced, *betwixt us*. And **שׁבעו'** they swore to each other ; they gave each other the Security desired, by denouncing a Curse against him who should injure the other. The manner of speaking, as *Deut. i. 34. &c al.* plainly shews that the אלה was understood ; *The Lord was wroth and sware, saying, if one of these Men shall see that good Land*. Here some *Execratory* Form of Words must be understood as spoke, or it is not Sense. *Swore, if they shall*, is imperfect by itself, and so the Translations alter it into — *He swore, they shall not*. *Alab* then is the principal and expressive Word. So that giving the Title of *Aleim* to Jehovah implies he had denounced that Curse, which hath the Obligation of an Oath on himself, and every one else that is concerned in the Covenant. And is the more proper Word to take the Name of God from, as it is so directly expressive of that great and important Denuntiation, which is an *Oath* ; and implies that the supreme Power belongs to him ; and as it is not applicable to Men as the other Word is ; it expressing an Act of Power, which none besides but the Vicegerents of God can exercise. Any one was נשבע by hearing the *Alab* ; but he was not אלה the Pronoucer of it. The Obligation God had laid himself under to Men, or rather, that God had laid himself under an Obligation to *Abraham*, &c. is expressed by saying, *He נשבע was sworn to Abraham*

bam; and is a Word properly used when speaking of the Mercy (promised or) being promised, to him, but doth not express as *Alab* does, the mutual Obligation, or Tye which held both Parties. **נשׁבע** is not a *Covenant*, **אללהם** is, or is what is equivalent, and therefore it is **אללהם** which must be used to express *Persons in Covenant*.

I proceed now to the total Amount of the foregoing Observations, which the Doctor sums up, p. 71, *et seq.* in the following remarkable Words:

“ I. We are not able to say positively whether “ **אלהם** and **אלהוה** be derived at all—”

If we understand *Hebrew*, we are. We are as sure of it as we are that **נבוֹת** and **נְבָהִים** are so; or that *Writer* is derived from the Verb to *write*.

“ — We are not sure whether **אלהם**, though “ it has a plural Termination, like **מִם**, **חִיּם** and “ several others (in the Note) and **בָּעֵלִים** (אָבָנִים) “ may not yet have the Signification of a Noun “ singular.”

Man, it is true, is not infallible, and he may be in a Dream, when he thinks he sees the Sun at Noon. But he may be as sure that *Aleim* is plural, as he can be that any Word in any Language whatever is so. I know not that any of the above Words have the *Signification of Nouns singular*, and apprehend it would have strengthened the Doctor's Assertion, had he been pleased to have proved it. **מִים** is put for a Year; will the Doctor say, that the Word hath a *singular* Signification? Supposing now that **חִיּם** were used for *Life* (which is not proved) in the *singular Number*, there may be a Reason in the *radical Idea* of the Word as in **מִים**, and **מִים** is *Waters*, not *Water*. It is said that *Moses* should be **אֱלֹהִים** unto *Pbaroab*, *Exod. vii. 1.* If this is applying the Word to *Individuals*, it can be of but little Service to the Argument in Hand; and would have been as strong had it been said, I

will make thee אלהֹ to Pharoah. He was put in the Place, as *Exod. iv. 16.* instead of God; which doth not in the least affect the Number of Persons spoke of under the Word *Aleim*. The Doctor's Argument holds as strongly against a *Trinity of Persons* in God, as it doth against the *plural Sense of Aleim*; a Noun of Number, as Army, &c. may include many Individuals, and yet not have a *plural Termination*; but it is contrary to the common Rules of Grammar, for a *plural Noun* not to mean more than its *Singular* doth; but perhaps we are not sure that אלהֹ is the *singular* of אלהִים. And now we are got a *doubting*, perhaps we are not sure that Θεος is *singular* in *Greek*, which being supposed to be so, is the *Ground* of all this pretended *Uncertainty* about the *Number* that אלהִים is of. Whether such *Assertions* as these of the Doctor's are well advised, or judicious, must be left to others to judge.

Next we are not sure how to pronounce it, when the *Points* are set aside. And unless we are surer of the *Authority* of the *Points*, we cannot be sure of it when they are not set aside.

“ —Whether it should be pronounced *Elobim*, “ *Alobim*, *Elabim*, &c.”

If the *Points* are set aside, we might be sure, if it were not fashionable to doubt of every thing, that it can neither be *Elobim* nor *Alobim*, there being nothing but a *Point* to answer the *o*, and if we may not now be sure what Hand put in the *o*, I will grant we can be sure of nothing. The *Points* make it read *Elobim*, Dr. *Robinson*, *Aleim*; there being but the five Letters, *Aleph*, *Lamed*, *He*, *Jod*, and *Mem*, in the Word; but any Man may pronounce it as he pleases for us. We quarrel with no Man upon that Head; nor does it affect the *Dispute*; and I must beg leave to say, this *frivolous* *Cavil* has

been so often repeated, and so often answered, that *occidit crambre repetita*.

“ We are not sure whether it signifies properly “ a Judge or Judges,—or the Being that ought only “ to be adored.”

Then we are not sure that *God* and *Judge* do not mean the same in *English*; and we are not sure that there is a Difference betwixt the *Participle active*, and the *Participle passive*. אלהִים is not *passive*; *adored* is: And *only* cannot be comprised in the Verb. But all this is contrary to Promise, not to repeat the Objection that has been made and answered before, without *considering* the Answer. All these Objections stand at large in Mr. B——d's *Observations* and *Examination*, and are separately answered in our Replies. The Doctor hath left out the *Trash*, and the extreme foul *Language* in those *Pieces* of Mr. *Bedford's*, and omitted here and there some *Particulars* manifestly indefensible, and which gave an ill *Aspect* to the whole Argument, and has put the whole together in a manner far superior both for *Style* and *Method*; yet is there *very little* new in these *Dissertations*, as to the *argumentative* Part, *ut metaphoræ indulgeam*, or to speak in the Doctor's *Metaphor*, “ It is indeed the old stale “ Meat served up again, with little Variety as to “ the *Dishes* themselves, though in respect to the “ *Disposure and Garniture* of them, the superior “ Art and Skill of the Cook must need be acknow- “ ledged.” It is said indeed that *B——d* had more *Coadjutors*; that may be true or not; it is certain he had not palled our *Appetites* with stay- ing. But to proceed.

2. We are to be contented with our *Ignorance* about this and many other points concerning *He- brew*; and had we been contented with ours, I suppose we should have been liked better. After this follows a String of *Whethers*, which are *neither de- termined*,

terminated, it is said, in *Scripture* nor by any sufficient and undoubted *Authority*. If we are to believe nothing but what has never been doubted of, we shall have but very little left to be sure of. Whether *Matter* exists, and whether there be a God, have been disputed and doubted of. Whether *Moses* was inspired, whether God can speak to Man, nay, whether *Moses*'s Law was not a Puppet-Shew has been doubted of, and some eminent Divines have published their Doubts upon that Head. And if the *Hebrew* Tongue be so very uncertain, as represented, there can be no undoubted *Authority* to determine any thing. And when *Christ* and his Disciples refer us to *Moses* and the Prophets, they send us a Wool-gathering, to wander in a Mist, where we cannot discern a Man from a Tree. And it must not be said here that we have the New Testament; and though we are *once* referred to the Old, we can do without it; for the Old is the *Record*; and if *once* referred to means *but once*, as a casual or accidental thing, it is a manifest Falshood, and a very dangerous one. The New Testament on every occasion; and in numberless Places referring to the Old, as the authentic Evidence of *Christ*, and professes to say *none other things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come*.

But suppose the last *Whether* (or indeed any of them) had been backed with Authorities of Credit, or which is much better with any *plausible Reasons*, it would have been no more than might have been expected, especially as nothing is said about them in the *foregoing Observations*, which the Doctor professed here to give us the Amount of. And though the Doctor puts it among the disputed Points, on which the learned and their Arguments are equally divided;

“ Whether *Hebrew* be like the rest of the Oriental
 “ Languages, no more than a Plank of the Ship-
 “ wreck at *Babel*.”

Yet the great *Ravis*, who was well versed in these Matters, says quite otherwise, that, *All the best Authors do earnestly contend to have Hebrew escape a Confusion at Babel*, Gen. Gram. p. 66. *Ravis* says, *All the best Authors* are on our Side, and let the Doctor produce one Man of Note who says otherwise. And I beg leave to say, we have just the same Reason to believe *Hebrew* to have been the Language of *Adam*, as we have that it was the Language of *Abraham*. *Moses* writes the History of both in that Language; records their Speeches in it; gives them *Hebrew* Names; as well as the Places occasionally mentioned. *Eden* is as much *Hebrew* as *Canaan*, and *Adam* as *Abraham*; and we have not one Hint to the contrary that it was not the Language of *Adam*. But the Tower of *Babel* has been a very unfortunate Rock to the Learned, many of whom have made Shipwreck there of their common Sense; but I cannot find that one Language was ever wrecked there.

Many may have doubted about these and other Points, and will for ever doubt about these, and open a Door to doubt about every thing else in Scripture, as long as that execrable Rabble called the *Rabbins*, are suffered to teach or influence us in the Construction of Scripture, in spite of so many Cautions of *Christ* and his Disciples to the contrary; and so many undisputed Objections to them, and uncontested Disqualifications argued against them.

“ 3. Lastly,—Supposing the Word must have
 “ a Root, and we must find it out, why may we
 “ not search for it in a kindred Tongue.

There is no kindred Tongue to search for it in. This has been shewn at large, and should have been contested before it had been asserted again that there is. How a Derivation from *Arabic*, i. e.

giving

giving the Sense of a Word in *Hebrew*; from the Sense of a Word that is supposed to sound something like it in *Arabic*, or *Dutch*, or *English*, can be called *very specious*, is very strange, unless every thing a Dr. *Pocock*, or, &c. asserts, is *ipso dicto, very specious*. If the *Testamentum Jacobi*, and some other later Attempts to lose the Scriptures in the Confusion of *Arabic* do not give a Man of Sense a Surfeit, and fill the Mind of the Christian with Horror, I must say it is because he does not duly consider the Consequences, or know the Value of the rich Jewel they are burying under that Heap of Rubble. Whether it would be more to the Credit, or more in the Character of a Christian Divine, to spend his Time in shewing the Certainty and Perfection of the *Word* (and Words) of God; or their *Uncertainty*; in making All *doubtful* and *questionable*, or *clear* and *plain*, let any one judge. We have often called in this Dispute upon those who propose the *Arabic* Sense of the Words, that are supposed to sound like the *Hebrew*, for the Sense of those *Hebrew* Words, to give any Reason why we should think them the same Words; or that the *Mahometans* use them in the same Sense the Prophets did? But not a Word of Answer is youchsafed. The Doctor is pleased to say, *Note, p. 74.*

“ There are other Opinions (he might have said, “ and Reasons too) against this *Arabic* Derivation “ produced by Mr. H——n,— which I shall not “ undertake to discuss.”

I believe so. Nor do I find that any Body else cares to discuss this Point; but then he shquld have let the *Arabic Derivation* alone. For whatever Pains it may cost the *Arabians* to blanch their *Aethiop*, they must do so, before they can produce him for a white Man. Whether *Hebrew* was the original Language of the World, matters not a great deal to our present Dispute, but that it is

old

old enough to exclude the *Arabic*, and that *Arabic* was no Language till after *Christ*, have been attempted to be shewn, and attentive Judges will be apt to suspect that no great Matter can be alledged to the contrary, since it is not offered at, though so great a Stress is laid upon the contrary Supposition. And when the Doctor is pleased to say,

“ That the Arguments built on the mere *Presumption* of the *Hebrew* Tongue being the original Language of the World, and the *Arabic* being no Language till after *Christ*, will not have any Weight in this Case with attentive Judges.”

Note, p. 74.

He seems to forget that he set out as an Advocate before a Judge, obliged to determine the Evidence produced in Court; and who could never determine any Point, if one of the Counsel’s saying the Evidence brought against him was not worth hearing; or ought not to determine the Point; or he was in *too much haste to answer it*, or any such self-betraying Plea were admitted of. The Objections to the *Arabic* lay in Court; if the Doctor doth not chuse to contest them, let *Mahomet*, and his Apostate Co-adjutors, who hatched it, keep it to themselves, and not bring it into a Dispute, where if it had ever so much right to appear it cannot be admitted till cleared from the Disqualifications objected; for it is an Abuse of the Patience of the Court to call that *mere Presumption* which has not been shewn to be so; as it is a Violation of all Law, and an Affront to the common Sense of Mankind, to offer to set up a *Copy* against an *Original*.

Were it not in a Matter of so great Consequence, as the determining, with *Precision*, the Meaning of the most important Words Man can be concerned with, it would make one laugh to see what a Variety of Senses the *Arabic* Doctors give the *Hebrew* Word נַחַת, and are each in their Turn contended for, under as much

much seeming Conviction, as the *H—ns* contend for the Sense the Prophets give the Word. See p. 15. 73—5. & al. To *worship*, *bowl*, *lament*, *tremble*, *admire*, *bind*, *bind by Oath*, and no doubt of it, by the same, or the like Rules, they turn *Arabic* into *Hebrew*, to come at these Senses, you might get twenty more. Amazing! that a Christian Divine should not see the extreme — what shall I call it to avoid giving Offence? — of spending his Time in such a Hodge-Podge of Languages to construe the Bible by it. And that another serious and zealous Christian should think it consistent with his Character either as a Scholar, or *D. D.* to take so much Pains to recommend it to Christians not to *be nice about* the true and real meaning of the Words of God, when you cannot come at the *Things* but through the Words; and nothing can be *made to accord*, if the Words do not. This looks something like what God complains of, *Jer. ii. 13.* *My People have committed two Evils; they have forsaken me the Fountain of living Waters, and bewed them out Cisterns; broken Cisterns that can hold no Water.* The Sands of *Arabia* can hold no Water; and what drains through them is hot and stinking, and can serve no End, but to corrupt the pure Water it is mixed with.

Dr. Sharp, p. 80. cites the *Remarks*, p. 129. That *Gouffet* had given us *Reasons*, why “we are not “to depend upon the *LXX*, or other *Greek Versions* “nor on the *Vulgate*, or other *Oriental Versions*; “nor to take the Rules of Grammar from any of “their Rules; but to examine each Word in the “*Hebrew* Scripture by the Usage in itself, &c.” and then cries out,

“ It was ungenerous in *Gouffet* not to acquaint the “ learned *World*, how this Art of examining each “ Word by the Usage in itself, without Dependance “ on

“ on any Versions, Old or New, might be attained to.”

Mr. H——n has been so generous as to acquaint the *unlearned World* with this Art. The Learned have no need of the Teacher. *Depending upon Versions* seems naturally too mean, being determined solely by the Authority of the Translator; which we are not, when the Context, Rules of Grammar, parallel Places, and so on, shall lead us to correct the Version of a Word in this or that Place, and conform it to the Idea it has, and necessarily must have in others. *Examining a Word by the Usage in itself*, is the examining the Sense the Word is used in in other Inflections of it; for as all the Members and Parts of the Body, make up the Body and are, *itself*, so all the *Derivatives* of a Word may be called *itself*; and the Usage or Sense it is used in those Derivatives, is the *Usage in itself*, which is infinitely a more natural Way of coming at the Sense of a Word in Scripture, than going to the Alcoran for it, or taking it upon Credit from this or that Version.

We are in *p. 80.* of the learned *Dissertations*, where, as for a Page or two before and after, a great Stress is laid upon the *LXX Construction* of the Word אלהים, and its Authority pleaded in this Dispute, when but a few Pages before, where its Authority naturally came under Consideration, it was turned off with saying, *I am obliged for Brevity's sake not to enter into that part of the Dispute, p. 54.* at the Bottom of *p. 78*, it is acknowledged that we have *insinuated*,

“ That the holy Writers had their Reasons for leaving the true Meaning of this important Word—to be fetched by Christian Believers from the original Hebrew.”

Not one of which ever attempted it, as far as we know; at least,

“ For

“ For seventeen Centuries do not appear to have
“ found it.”

And what an unpardonable Insolence is it for any to look for it now, where others have so long neglected ; and pretend to find what others never looked for. In this Stile did some eminent Men complain of the new Translation of the Bible—
“ Many Mens Mouths have been open a good
“ while, and yet are not stopped, with Speeches
“ about the Translation.—*Hath* the Church been
“ deceived, say they, all this while ? *Hath* her
“ sweet Bread been mingled with Leaven ; her
“ Silver with Dross, her Wine with Water ?—
“ *Hath* the Bread been delivered by the *Fathers of*
“ *the Church*, and the same proved to be *lapido-*
“ *sus* ? What is it to handle the Word of God *de-*
“ *ceitfully*, if this is not ? Thus certain Brethren,”
See the Translators Preface to the Reader, and the Answer that follows to the above Complaint, too long to be cited ; and too home to be applied.

Every Man may *pause* in yielding his Assent to what others advance ; but according to the common Rules of Disputation, no one has a Right to *desire* of their Adversaries,

“ That they would enlarge in their Proofs.”
p. 81.

Till what they have thought proper to bring, has had some sort of Answer or other. The Doctor desires,

“ Particularly, that the Serious and Inquisitive
“ may be indulged in *a more satisfactory* Account,
“ than hath been hitherto given, how it comes to
“ to pass, that *Christ* and his Apostles, should be
“ totally silent on this very interesting Interpretation of *Alein*, as well as on a Number of
“ others.”

It is fact that they are so. And it is a Question worthy to employ the Pen of a learned Man, and one

one so eminent in the Church as the Doctor himself. There are Faults, and *perhaps* some pretty material Ones in the LXX, which *Christ* and his Apostles did not think proper to correct, and when the Doctor hath shewn why our Account of this Matter is not *satisfactory*, he may ask for *a more satisfactory* one, in the mean time let me ask for any satisfactory Account, why a Man of Sense and Learning should act so inconsistently with himself, as to ask for an Answer to a Question, he hath neither Time nor Inclination to lend an Ear to? *Brevity* permits him to spin out several Pages in putting a Question, the Answer to which he hath not time to consider. Either allow we have satisfactorily answered the Question, or shew we have not. We have answered upon the Authority, and in the Words of *Christ*, that the *Hebrew* was the *Record*, which a Claimant under was not to construe for himself. And in the Words of our own *Church*, that " *the LXX is not sound and perfect, but needs in many Places Correction.*" And again, " *The Seventy were Interpreters, they were not Prophets.* " They did many things well, as learned Men, " but yet as Men they *stumbled and fell*, one while " through Oversight, another while through Ignorance." Here none could so properly interpose as Apostles and apostolick Men, say they, but " making a new Translation in that new World, " and green Age of the Church, would have exposed them to many Exceptions, and Cavillations, as though they had made a Translation to " serve their own Turn, and therefore bearing witness to themselves, their Witness was not to be regarded ;" cited *Examiner Examined*, p. 36. One would have thought that this might have been *satisfactory* to one who is a Pillar of that Church which talks in this Strain ; at least, that he might have condescended to have taken some Notice of it,

if not for our Sakes, yet for theirs who first made the Apology for themselves ; and indeed *Truth* and *Candour* required it with regard to us, when he was condemning us for disregarding the Authority of the Church on this very Head, *for seventeen Centuries past*. Besides our own Church, I cited that great Critick and learned Man, Doctor *Hare*, Bishop of *Chichester*, and then a living Ornament of the Church, that *the LXX was an ill Version, Examiner Examined*, p. 54. And if these Authorities are not thought sufficient, I am ready to prove it by an Induction of Particulars ; if the Doctor will condescend to enter into the Contest with me upon it. This is no more than the *Crambe Repetita* of *Bedford*, who flourished away upon it, not so *rhetorically*, yet full as learnedly, and as much to the Purpose as the Doctor hath done ; very possibly the Answer may not have given Satisfaction, because it doth not admit of a Reply ; but for *Form sake*, something should have been said, by way of Reply.

But let me not, before I close this Dissertation on *הַלְּאָלָה*, pass what does look like an Argument, p. 82.

“ — How this sacred Writer, who thought it worth his while to interpret *Melchisedek* and *Salem* in the *Greek Tongue*, should neglect the more important Interpretations, especially that principal one of *Aleim.*”

I answer the LXX have over and over again interpreted, *Melchi*, *Sedeck*, and *Salem*, as the Apostle doth ; it is no Argument therefore that he should have corrected the LXX in other Instances because he followed them in this. But supposing he had corrected them in some Particulars, is that any Reason why we should suppose they might not be wrong in others ? He explains and applies some of the *Types* and *Ceremonies*, of others he says, *ex eis* —

νοο λεγειν χατα μερος, it is not proper for me, or, it is not my Business to speak of particularly.

I hope none of Mr. H——n's Friends take it amiss, that these Objections are offered to their Sense and Etymology of this Word; or if any other should to his Construction of any other *Words*; and, for my own Part, I return the Doctor my hearty Thanks for the Favour he has done us; and hope he will excuse a little Freedom of Expression, which in some Parts of the Dispute I may have indulged, not from any the least Disrespect to a Gentleman, whose Person I am utterly unacquainted with, but for want of knowing better; and if I knew of any thing but what is, I do not say *justifiable*, but, necessary to the Argument and the Manner of treating of it before me, I would strike it out, and shall be ready to make all proper Acknowledgments.

THE

SCRIPTURE MEANING

OF

BERITH, &c.

BERITH, as carrying in it the Idea of *Purification*, is the other of the two Words which Dr. Sharp contests; as they

" Seemed to claim the first Consideration, both
" on account of their Importance—and of their
" Consequence in Mr. H——n's System," *Pref.*
" p. 16.

These two Words are Words of great Importance and Consequence, but not of that Consequence to Mr. H——n's System as is insinuated; that,

Collapsa ruant subductis Tecta Columnis.

Pray what is that *Plan* of Mr. H——n's, and *Superstructure* resting on these *Corner-Stones*, that shaking them should so far weaken and discredit the whole; as to render any further Pains about it superfluous? What he builds on *Aleim* is, that there are more Persons than one in *Jehovah*, co-equal, and who have laid themselves under the Obligation of an Oath, in behalf of those who will rely on them. The Doctor has taken great Pains to separate this Idea or Meaning from the Word; a small Part of which Pains, had it been taken in impartially examining the Use of it in Scripture, would have shewn him its Beauty and Propriety; and the Happiness of Mr. H——n's Judgment in hitting upon that Con-

struction of it, which at once puts an End to a Dispute on which the Learned have been so much and so long divided ; and which was thought so difficult a Point, and yet a Point so necessary to be cleared, that like *Saul*, when they could get no Answer, *neither by Dreams, nor by Urim, nor by the Prophets*, because they sought it not after the due Order, they have had recourse to *Apostates from God*, and preposterously hoped the Spirit of Antichrist could give them that Light which they thought the Spirit of God had denied them. Were it to be proved [for I hope I may say it is not yet done] that Mr. *H—n* is mistaken in his Construction, he had been but mistaken in a single Word, and the Doctrine would have been true, whether *Alein* taught it or no. I flatter myself I have given the Doctor some Reason to think, that though Mr. *H—n*'s Authority is not ab-so-lute-ly de-cisive, (who had so little of the *High-Priest* in him, that he allowed no Authority but that of inspired Men decisive) that yet his *Reasons* may go further than was apprehended.

I shall now enquire what Success the Doctor hath had in his Exceptions to Mr. *H—n*'s Construction of *Berith* ; which he chuses to take from Mr. *C—*'s *Sermon*, because as I apprehend Mr. *C—*'s Interpretation of *Adam*, *Hos. vi. 7.* gives him an Advantage at setting out, which he has no just Title to ; and which though Disputants will take against one another sometimes, yet it is mere Disputants that do so. Mr. *C—* construes, *Hos. vi. 7.* “ *But they like Adam have transgressed the Covenant ; the Terms required on the Part of Man.* ” I think the Doctor's Inference from hence. p. 85, is just,

“ Therefore I must presume Mr. *C—* means by “ *Terms*, the *Terms of the Covenant*, and that *Berith* “ is rightly, even according to him, translated *Covenant* “ in this Place.”

I allow that according to him, it is, and that it is as applicable to *Adam* as it is to *Ephraim*. But is *Adam* according to the *Prophet* rightly interpreted? For if *Adam* means Men, the Gentiles, Nations; then this Difficulty against the Sense of *Berith* vanishes; and all that can be said is, that Mr. C— hath over-hastily or incautiously misconstrued or misapplied one Word in a Text, which by that means turns Evidence against him, and that Dr. Sharp hath as hastily catched at an Advantage that fails him. Our *English* Translation, *which it is but just and fitting to defend*, if so be it is not, as I can conceive it is not, to be censured in this Matter, reads it *MEN* in this Text; *they like Men have transgressed*, that is, like other Men, the Nations around them; all of whom, almost to a Man, had by this time entirely forsaken the Law of God, once in the Possession of their Fathers. The *H—ns* take upon them often to correct the *Translation*, but they give their Reasons for doing it. The Doctor doth not condescend to make any Apology for this Slight he puts upon it; but passes it by without taking any notice of it; he cannot justify himself that Mr. C— construes it so, because he shou'd not have been led by one, whom he professedly writes to correct for having mistaken the Sense of Scripture; and being too bold and forward to give into *novel* Explications of it, and therefore ought to have suspected the Construction merely because it was Mr. C—'s, especially as the *LXX* have given it another turn too. But the Reader may see that *Authorities*, which are thought of great Weight when they are on our side, are got over without much Difficulty when they don't rightly quadrate with our own Notions. I need not prove that *Adam* may be translated *Men*, as our *English* Translation hath it, it being so often used for Men or Mankind, as well as the first Man. Nor need I prove that *Adam* is used for other Men, in contradistinction to the People of God. A Text or two

however may be cited, *Ps. lxxvi. 10. The Wrath of Man shall praise thee ; lxxxii. 7. I have said ye are Aleim ; and all of you Children of the most High ; but ye shall die like Adam, other, or common, Men ; cv. 14. When they went from one Nation to another ; from one Kingdom to another People, He suffered not Adam to hurt them. Isai. ii. 16, and xlivi. 4. I gave Egypt for thy Ransom ; — I gave Adam (Men) for thee ; and Peoples for thy Life.* The Complaint in *Hosea* is against *Epbraim* and *Judah*, the People of God, for transgressing the *Purification*, (or that which the *Purification* they had received as the People of God required of them) as *Men*, the Nations around them had done. The Complaints in the Prophets, one and all of them, are so many against them, for walking in the Ways of the Nations, and doing after all their Abominations, worshipping Idols, committing Thefts, Whoredom, Adultery, and Murders, that they need not be cited. These things did not *Adam* the first Man, that we know of ; but these things did Men then ; these things did the *Affyrians*, to whom, as in the *Chapter* before, *Epbraim* had joined himself, and did as they did, as we know from the *History*. What God then tells *Epbraim* in the Words under Dispute, is, “ I desired Mercy of you “ and not Sacrifice, and the Knowledge of God “ more than Burnt-Sacrifice ; but you have done “ like the Gentiles, transgressed the *Purification*, “ *broke thro' the bounds of that Holiness*, which I com-“ manded you, and dealt treacherously with me ; “ ye are Workers of Iniquity, and polluted with “ Blood.” I imagine the Doctor must have seen the Impropriety of comparing the Sins of *Epbraim* to the first Sin of *Adam*, had he not been in too much haste to confute Mr. C— ; and I presume it might have been expected that Dr. Sharp should have first proved that Mr. C— had rightly construed the Text, before he had drawn his Conclusion against him

him from his Construction of it. A Man of Candour and Ingenuity cannot plead it was not his Business to strengthen the Hands of his Opponent, by setting him right when he was betraying his own Cause, because in this Case he suffers their Sense of Scripture to be misrepresented, that he may the easier triumph over his Adversary ; which is setting his own Credit above that of the Word of God. Nor will, I apprehend, the Doctor plead, he did not look at the Text, to see what the Prophet meant. All therefore that remains to be said is, that Mr. C—— has rightly interpreted it ; which if he has not, the Doctor hath built on a bad Foundation. Possibly Mr. C—— might have had something to have said in his own Vindication, which doth not occur to me ; but as I think him wrong, I do for him, what I have a great deal of reason to think he would have done for himself, and what I would readily do for myself, acknowledge a Mistake when it appears to me.

The next Objection respects the Sense of *Carath*, which though wherever it is used, except with *Berith*, signifies universally to *slay* or *cut off*, must be overruled in this single Instance ; and be supposed to signify *to make or agree upon Terms* ; a wide Difference ! And the Authority of Mr. C—— himself is brought to justify the confounding the Sense of it, and overturn his own Construction.

“ The Word in *Deuteronom. xxix. 12.* which our
“ Translators have render’d by *made*, is *Carath*. Yet
“ Mr. C—— doth not venture to correct, or seem
“ to blame our Translation for not rendering it, *bis*
“ *Oath* which the Lord thy God *cutteth off* with
“ thee this Day.” p. 85.

It is true that Mr. C—— in his *State of the Case*, does as the Doctor says, apply *He made it*, [in the *Hebrew*, *He cut off*,] to the *Oath* ; but most likely had not the *Hebrew* Word then before him, or in his Thoughts, but took it as it stood in the *English* Translation, it not being the Sense of *Carath* then in

Dispute, but whose the *Alab* was, that is mentioned in the Text, which Mr. *Bedford*, as the Doctor since, would against all *Possibility* ascribe to the People, and not *Jehovah*.

It is a known thing that two *Nouns* shall often come together with a Verb after them that can't *properly* or *strictly* belong to but one of them, and yet that shall give no handle to the Critick entirely to explain away the Sense of the Verb. In this manner our *Translators* seem to have taken *Carath* in this Text, as relative to both the preceding *Nouns*, though properly and strictly belonging only to *Berith*, as its Application in so many other Texts, and the Sense they *there*, and *here too*, give it, seemis to require. *To make an Oath* with a Person, is better, tho' not much better, *English* and Sense, than *chopping* or *striking* an Oath with him. *To take* or *give* an Oath, is intelligible ; but to *make an Oath* with a Man, is as remote from common Use, as taking and giving a Covenant would be. So that *Carath*, as the *English* reads it, doth not so properly belong to *Alab*, as to *Berith*, and might have escaped a Metaphrasis on the Authority of this Passage, by the common Rules of Construction, though I believe the Scripture is more exact in its *Phraseology* than to stand in need of this Defence, as may perhaps appear presently.

But by the bye, if the Doctor take the advantage of this supposed Concession of Mr. C—'s, then he must allow that Mr. C— has produced *one Place* in Scripture where *Alab* is used for God's Oath ; and he must retract what he says p. 78, that *יְהוָה* is only used for God's *Act of swearing throughout the Scripture*. And a great deal that is built upon that Assertion falls with it. If God made (*Alab*) the Oath, then it was *his*. I remark this not so much to shew, that the *H—ns* are the most unfortunate Creatures living ; and are so unhappy as never to be in the right, which side soever of the Question they take, (which I do not ascribe to Prejudice against them, so much as

to a peculiar Dexterity in their Opponents to prove the same thing right and wrong in different Parts of the Argument, as it best serves the Turn) but as it gives some Ground for a Query how the Doctor could think the Text was rightly rendered, when he could not but see, that if it were so, the greater Part of his other *Dissertation* is overthrown. As the Doctor construes the Text here, the *Oath* or *Alab* is made by *Jebovah*,—*his Alab which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this Day*: He maketh the Oath with his People, and therefore it was his *Alab*; a Point strenuously denied throughout the whole Argument of the preceding Enquiry into the *Etymology* of *Aleim*, see p. 28 and 29. Could Dr. *Sharp* think that right here, which was so wrong there? And yet God's making the *Alab* is here the Ground of his whole Argument against Mr. *C*—, and on the Strength of which he thinks,

“ That the Dispute about this Word should seem
“ to be at an End,” p. 86.

The Doctor might be pleased with seeming to have so effectually enclosed Mr. *C*—, and caught him in a Snare; but where is the Ingenuity and Candour, which one knows not how to separate from Dr. *Sharp*? If Mr. *C*— hath translated the Text wrong here, why not ingenuously give us the true Sense of it, without any Regard to its supporting his own or his Adversary's Argument? Let Truth prevail with whomsoever it is found, and self be set aside in the Enquiry. If the Text is rightly translated, why not candidly acknowledge before, that if *God made an Alab*, *He made an Alab*. Some Apology will be necessary here, as far as I can see, for no body will easily think that Dr. *Sharp* could forget what he had said but a few Pages before, and laid so much Stress upon: Or that a Man of his Sagacity should see the same Thing in so different a Light in the Company of a few Pages. This can-

not be accidental ; God's not *making* the *Alab* is the Ground he proceeds upon through the whole preceding Dispute ; but God's actually making it, the Ground of this.

But to the Text, *Deut.* xxix. 12. The Context runs thus, ver. 10. *Ye stand this Day, all of you, before the Lord your God.* — Ver. 12. *That ye should enter into the Berith of the Lord your God, and into his Execration (Alab) אֲשֶׁר as (or according to what) the Lord your God hath cut off with you to Day.* says *Marius de Cal, est dictio que ligat interdum usurpatur pro Conjunctionibus, ut, כי למן quia, quod, propterea quod, אֲשֶׁר si, cum, כן sic, ita imo, et pro 1 capula, בְּאַשֶּׁר sicut, juxta, secundum, quemadmodum.* And *Cocceius* gives various Instances where אֲשֶׁר is the same as בְּאַשֶּׁר, *potest etiam capi pro בְּאַשֶּׁר, (inter al.) 1 Sam. xv. 20, Jer. xxxiii. 22. Deut. xi. 27. Take אֲשֶׁר in the Place in dispute, in the Sense it hath in so many others, as an *Adverb* or *Conjunction*, not a *Pronoun*, and the Difficulty is got over at once.* — *That ye should enter into the Purification of Jekovah your Aleim, and into his Execration (denounced to bind in Covenant) according as he has cut off with you to-day.* The Doctor will not call this an arbitrary Interpretation of אֲשֶׁר, for since it hath this Sense in other Places, it may have it here. And it will only remain to shew the Propriety of the Phrase, which is not immediately before us, the Point being now to shew, that *Carath* cloth not relate to *Alab*, and the Doctor hath failed in his Attempt to prove that *Berith* may in one Text be translated *Covenant* without any Idea of *Purification* annexed ; and *Carath* in another be rendered to make, without conveying the Notion of cutting off.

There is another Text produced to the same Purpose with these, p. 118. which I shall take in here, as its proper Place. The Text is *Neb.* ix. 38. *Because of all this we אֶמְנָה וּכְתָבִים וְעַל חֲתֹונָה cut*

put off (viz. a *Purification*) in Truth, and write and seal. Just as *Moses* wrote the Words in a Book, and called upon the People to give their Assent, and then slew the Sacrifice of Purification, and sprinkled them with its Blood. Of which presently. This Passage favours the Doctor's Purpose a little, as it stands in the *English*, *Because of all this we make a sure Covenant, and write it, and our Princes, Levites, and Priests seal unto it.* Mr. *H——n* had observed, *Trin. Gent.* p. 369. that *Berith* is not used here, meaning I apprehend, that it is not said, *they writ the Berith*; nor does the Sense require the *it* which our Translation puts in; nor the *unto it* at the End of the Verse: though something must be understood after **כְּרֻתִים** and **כְּתֻבִים** both. They *slew* the Sacrifice, and *writ* what they promised to perform, with an *Execration* against those who should not perform all the Words of it. See *ver. 29.* of the next Chapter, and whether our Translators have (as the Doctor sneers Mr. *H——n* with allowing, without any Foundation,)

“ For once, however, rightly used *Covenant*, “ where there was no *Berith* to be mistranslated,”

May be disputed still. This was a solemn Promise to God to keep all the *Law*; and they bound themselves to Performance in the strongest manner they were able, by *Sacrifice*, by a Curse, by their Hand and Seal. But this cannot be properly called a *Covenant*; or if it may, it is not the *Berith* which is *writ*, but the *Curse* and *Oath* to *walk in God's Law, and to observe, and to do all the Commandments of Jeboyah our Lord, and his Judgments*, *Neh. x. 29.* And yet at first View this looks like a *written Covenant*; nor is it, indeed, the only Place that looks like it, for *Deut. xxix. 21.* (see *Dissert.* p. 119.) doth also look like it. *All the Curses of the Covenant written (הכתרות) in this Book of the Law.*

Law. But it is not necessary to refer to הכתובה of Berith and not to אלות, because of the Termination of the *Participle* in what we call the singular *Number*, while אלהּ is *plural*; there are so many Instances of the like Nature in Scripture, that it will not follow from hence, that it is the Berith and not the *Curses* which were written; and in the Verse before it is the כל אלהּ whole Curse, or all the Curse which is said to be written.

“ Here is a Berith written in a Book. It can-
“ not be rendered a Purifier or a Purification writ-
“ ten in this Book, for what mean the Curses of
“ the Purifier or Purification?” p. 119.

It is not certain that it is Berith which is said to be written; and the *Curses of the Purification* will mean the Curses pronounced when they entered into a *Purification* with God, by passing between the Parts, and being sprinkled with the Blood of the *Purification-Sacrifice*. But it was not for this Purpose I cited the last Words, but because of the Difficulty thought to attend the Translation of Berith, and which the Doctor often suggests in the Course of his Argument; whereas ברית is both *Purifier* and *Purification*, and the *Sacrifice*; all which go by the same Name. And כרת is used with ברית as תורה is used with other Words. תורה is *Confession* or *Thanksgiving*; and is the *Sacrifice* also. And if you consider the *Sacrifice* as a Type, which they all were, then it must be a *personal Noun*, or Name of an *Agent*, as much as Berith is. ובת תורה is literally, to slay a *Confession*, 2 Chron. xxix. 31. Bring Slaughters, and זבחים תזרות Confessions. Lev. vii. 15. The Flesh of the *Sacrifice* the תורה חטא his Sin, is used in the same Manner, Lev. iv. 29. He shall lay his Hand upon the Head of the Sin, and slay the Sin, in the Place of עליה the Ascension, vii. 37. להחתת ולאשם Pag. Peccatorio and Culpatorio; so the Greeks

Greeks called their *Oath-Sacrifice*, or the *Creature* they cut off at making a *Covenant*, *Οπίσιον*, i. e., *Juratorium*. The Doctor is well acquainted with the Scripture Phraseology, and knows that the Title of the Sacrifices expressed the *Design* for which they offered them; and the above, and many others, would make just the same uncouth Figure, as *cutting off a Purification, transgressing, and breaking through a Purifier*, are represented as doing, if the Translators had not taken a Liberty which I suppose will not be allowed us, of adding *Offering*; and using the Word *Sacrifice* where a literal Translation would be *flat* and *low*; and perhaps seem obscure and confused. *Killing a Confession* is in the English, a *Sacrifice of Thanksgiving*, and the Head of the Sin, the Head of the *Sin-Offering*. And בָּרָת, which signifies to *cut off a Piece*, or *cut in Pieces*, may as well have the Idea of *sacrificing* annexed to it, as בָּרֵת which simply is to *kill*; for *sacred* is no Part of the natural Meaning of one more than the other: But that would lose the *Antiquity* of the Custom, which is preserved by retaining the Sense of *Carath* in *cutting*; but it would have saved the most plausible Objection to our Construction of the Phrase. And I beg leave to observe it here, before we enter into the Subject, that according to the Usage of the Hebrew, and other *ritual* Words, we may translate *Berith*, either *Purifier* or *Purification*, and understand it either as an *Agent*, or *Action*, or the bare Title of a *Sacrifice*, as the Context shall require, or as it will run best in the Translation. And the Objections which are avoided, see p. 116. by using *Terms of Purification*, which the Doctor thinks there is no Authority for, are all avoided without it.

These killing Blows being broke, we may proceed with a little more Courage, for I must own had it fully appeared that there had been one Place where

where *Berith* could not convey the *Idea of Purification*, or *Carath* of cutting off, the *Dispute about those Words* would seem to have been at an End, which possibly it may not now be. The Reader may observe, that though the Doctor's Expressions are not altogether so *sanguine* as those we *H—ns* often use, *the Air of the whole is full as sanguine*.

“ The Matter might seem fairly enough to be
“ rested here, at least till the two Texts above
“ mentioned are cleared up—,” p. 87.

Which I am sure can never be done.

“ Yet as I have no other Aim than discovering,
“ as far as I can, the true Signification, Use,
“ and Propriety of *ברית*,”

Which I have declared, over and over again, I neither pretend to know, nor think it worth while to enquire after, as *Pref. p. 21. I do not undertake to determine what are the true and undoubted Roots of either of them,—because one would not be nice about Words, &c. and all Men have hitherto been satisfied with the old Account, and it is very strange that what hath given Satisfaction all along, should not do it now, yet*

“ I will examine more closely into its Etymology.”

Though were it not for the Insolence of Mr. *H—n*, and his Followers, I should not have thought it worth while; for *bad they submitted, with proper Deference, to the Judgment of others*; I should have been, for my Part, very little disposed to take Exceptions against them, or to discover any of my own Suspicions about them, *Pref. p. 14.*

But to the *Etymology* of *Berith*. The Pointers make two Words of this, as they do of *Alab*, whether from Design or Ignorance, matters not much at present. The Prophets have made no Difference in the Letters, and if the Context do not require, I do not say *possibly admit* of, but if the Context do not

require us to give a different Sense, Idea, or Meaning to the Word, in different Places, we cannot be justified in doing so on any other Authority whatever. If it appears that a Word hath such a Sense, or such an Idea annexed to it in some Places, or *in any one Place*, where there is no room to doubt of it; and that one Idea or Meaning will make Sense and Truth in all Places where the Word occurs, there will be sufficient Authority to justify us in correcting its *Misinterpretation* in other Places, which give it a different Sense. The *Community of Idea* in all Places where the Word occurs, is the Rule we justify our *novel* (as they call it) Interpretation of some Passages of Scripture by. The Holy Spirit was the Enditer of Scripture, and could want neither Abilities nor Inclination to speak with *Certainty* and *Perspicuity*. But if his Words have not always the same, but often *very different*, and sometimes *quite contrary* Meanings, there can be no Certainty or Perspicuity in the Writing. And as the *Hebrew* has been so long, and was when first translated, a dead Language, nothing but a *Community of Idea* in the same Word, in all its Derivatives, could enable us to come at the true Sense of the Text; which we must have taken *upon trust*, on the Authority of the Translators only. And then the uninspired Translation, and not the inspired Text, would have become the Rule of Faith. And if the Translation should happen to become a dead Language, which is the Case of the *LXX*, then we must have trusted to the Translation of a Translation; and the same might become again the Fate of the secondary Translation, as it has done of the *Vulgate*, and so on. And what the Poet says of Men, that every Generation degenerates, would have been true of the Translations; at least would have given a Handle for the Suggestion; and thereby the Word of God, which had received such a

Blow by being changed, in its first *Version*, into the Word of Man, must have lost all its Authority and Power. How should we have maintained its Infallibility in a human Translation? Difficulties may arise about the Meaning, but if we get the real Meaning of the *Word of God*, when we get the Meaning of the Words, it not only encourages us to search, but amply pays us for the Trouble. But now take the S S. in a Translation, you may get the true Sense of the Translators, but not the Meaning of the Word of God, which it is possible the Translators may have mistaken. And there is something extremely preposterous in pleading the *Construction of the Translation* against the *Construction of the Original*. By the *Construction of the Original*, I mean the Sense or Construction which the Original confessedly gives of the Word in dispute; or the Sense we are convinced the Word has in other Parts of the Original, which therefore is its Sense of that Word. And it must be observed, that the Version, whose Authority is pleaded against the Original in this Case, bears *double Evidence*, or Evidence on both sides of the Question, by giving the Word in dispute, the *two Senses* which occasion the Dispute; and since there are many Circumstances that will help to convince us, that a particular Word really has such a Meaning in such Places, though we might never have thought of that Meaning, had not the Translation helped us to it, we may be sufficiently justified in setting its *Authority* aside, and proceeding upon the Evidence that arises from the *Cross-Examination*. To illustrate my Meaning by an Instance or two, בְּרִית מִכְבָּסֶת is *Mal. iii. 2.* translated, the *Fullers Soap*; we have the Authority of the *Translations*, that כְּבָם is to *wash off* *Dirt* and *Sin*, and that בְּרִית is derived, signifies to *purify*; we may therefore see reason

reason to conclude that מכביסת is not *Fullers* in this Text, nor ברית *Soap*; the Words only saying, the Purification of those that wash or are washed; all the rest, (viz. that it is that particular *Washer*, they supposed a *Fuller* to be, and that sort of Purification we call *Soap*,) is the mere Opinion of the Translator, who has no Right to impose his own Opinion on another, and should have left it to the Reader to have judged what *Washing*, and what Purification was spoke of; the Reader will see I have not been wandering from the Subject in Hand, nor I hope, been talking idly, when he sees, I have had the following Concession of the Doctor's in my Eye; and which is the next Point, the Dispute calls us to.

“ I shall allow so far in Confirmation of Mr. C——’s Derivation that one Root of ברית is agreed upon; and the Sense of the Word as from that Root allowed, viz. *Soap* or the Means to wash away Uncleanness. • For however the Word be read *Boreth* or *Berith* in Jer. ii. 22. and Mal. iii. 2. the Context will oblige us to give it this Meaning in these two Places.”

We are therefore agreed that *Soap* hath its Name of *Berith* from a *Verb*, that signifies to purify, cleanse or do away Uncleanness. *Soap* therefore is not the Meaning of the Word; tho’ *Soap*, as many other Things may, from the Idea in the Word, be called by that Name. The Reader will attend to this Distinction, and I flatter myself think it right, as well as necessary to be made and attended to. And had *Berith* in the Texts above been rendered *Purification*, in the Abstract, we had had its true Sense, and the Meaning of the Prophets in the Passages, better perhaps than from the present Version; for there are various Sorts of Purification, though *Soap* is one Sort, but, I believe not the Sort the Prophets designed to bring to our Minds, by the Word in those

Places

Places. If the Reader recollect, or turn to the Passages in Scripture where בְּנֵי is rendered *Fuller* is used, he will perhaps be of my Mind: Exod. xix. 10. *Go unto the People and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their Cloaths.* v. 14. *Moses sanctified the People, and they washed their Cloaths.* After this God comes down upon the Mount in the *Chariot of Fire*, as described Gen. iii. ult. *flaming Fire*, confined within the Cloud and thick Darkness, and *rolling in upon itself*, and spake all the Words that follow to Ch. xxiv. when on the People's solemnly assenting to do all that the Lord had said, young Bulls are slain, and they are *purified* with its Blood; and in general he who was to be cleansed from any Impurities, natural or accidental, was to *wash his Cloaths* and then be purified with the Blood of a Bull, or Ram; and in Case of Poverty, with that of a young Pigeon or Turtle-Dove. In the Instance of that great *Impurity* or Imperfection, the Leprosy, which is compared to *Snow* (not for its Colour, as far as appears) and by what Aaron says, of *Miriam*, Numb. xii. 12. *let her not be as a dead Thing; as one at his coming out of his Mother's Womb, that half her Flesh should be consumed;* by this it looks as if the Leprosy were a Figure of what we are by *Nature*, dead in Sins; or continually breaking forth into *dead Works*, like that Distemper with dead Flesh rising and spreading in Cakes or Flakes of dry Scurf, one upon another, as *Snow* falls. In the *cleansing*, after this Impurity or Distemper was healed, several typical Rites were to be used, the last of which, that was previous to the *Purification* by Blood, was washing themselves and their Cloaths. Lev. xiv. *In the Day of his Cleansing he shall be brought unto the Priest; and the Priest shall go forth out of the Camp. The Priest shall command to take לְמַתָּהָר for him that is to be cleansed, two Birds, wild ones, clean ones, (not Sparrows as translated, but) Pigeons or Turtle-Doves, and Cedar-Wood,*

Wood, and Scarlet and Hyssop. The Priest was to wring off the Head of one of the Birds, and catch the Blood in a clean Vessel, held over a running Stream of Water ; then dip the living Bird in the Blood, and sprinkle **המטהר** him that was to be cleansed seven Times with the Blood, and **טהרו** declare him cleansed : and let the Pigeon covered with the Blood fly off into the open Fields ; that like the Scape-Goat he might carry off the Sin of the Person cleansed, and as far as the Allusion could go, up into Heaven with him, at least out of the Sight of Men ; for which Purpose the wild *Pigeon* was properest, as also because they build in the Rock, as *Cant. ii.*

14. *My Dove is in the Clefts of the Rock, in the secret Place of the Tower.* There needed not have been two He-Lambs, or two Pigeons, but that one could not shed its Blood, and after that fly off with it up into the Air, and so represent the coming to Life again of him, who carried that Blood which had purified himself and Mankind up into Heaven. So that the Birds are to be considered as one, as a Compound ; and here the covering, dipping, or rolling the Bird in Blood, was doing in Type what is said in Words of the *Original*, *Isai. ix. 5.* “ *The Garment rolled in Blood, and it shall be a Burning, and the Food of Fire.* ” As the Creature in the Type was killed, rolled in Blood, and then burnt, *Is. lxiii. 1. Who is this that cometh* **מַאֲדָוָם** dyed with Blood, or Blood Colour ? *Rev. xix. 13. Clothed with a Vesture dipped in Blood ; and his Name is called the Word of God.* In Allusion to this the Covering of the Tabernacle in which God dwelt amongst Men was to be *inter al.* the Skins of Rams **מַאֲרָמִים** dyed red. Before the Person to be cleansed could be purified with Blood, he was to wash his Cloaths in Water, *Exod. xiv. 8. He that is to be cleansed shall wash his Cloaths, and shave off all his Hair, and wash himself in Water*—on the seventh Day—and on the eighth

Day, he shall take two He-Lambs, or ver. 22. *Turile Doves, or two young Pigeons, and one shall be a Sin-Offering; and the other a Burnt-Offering.* So that here the Purification of **מִכְבָּשִׂת** those who were washed, was not *Soap*, but *Fire, Blood, with Cedar, תְּלִיעַת שְׂנִי* and *Hyssop, Salt, Oil, and living Water.* They might multiply these Ingredients, as *Jeremiab* says, and repeat the *typical Purification* ever so often, but where Faith and Obedience were wanting, the Spot of Sin could not be reached; *though thou wash thee with Nitre, and multipliest to thyself the Purification, thine Iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God.* And nothing but the Purification of Christ, and his Blood, can reach the Soul and do away the Uncleanliness of it. Such Things as could bear the Fire, were to be washed or cleansed by it; other Things by Water, Salt, Oil; Man could not bear the Fire, and therefore he was to be cleansed by pure Water of his own applying; and by Blood, &c. applied to him by the Priest, and by the Fire on his Representative. *The Blood of Bulls and of Goats, and the Sibes of an Heifer sprinkling the Unclean, sanctified to the purifying of the Flesh.* This is the Purification, it is likely, that *Christ* is compared to by the Prophet *Malachi*, which Passage, I shall take the liberty to translate from the Original.

“Behold, I send my Agent, that he may prepare the Way before me: And suddenly shall come to his Temple the Lord, whom ye seek; even the Agent of the Purification whom ye shall delight in: Behold he cometh, saith Jehovah of Hosts. But who may abide the Day of his coming? And who shall stand when he appeareth? For he shall be like the Fire, *searching*, and like the Purification of them that are washed. And he shall **בָּשַׁ** blow (from **נְשַׁבָּ**) a Refiner and Cleanser of Silver; and he shall cleanse the Sons of Levi (the coupled one) and purge them as the Gold

“ Gold and Silver,” (suppose it meant the Gold and Silver in the Temple, which was seven times tried and purified) “ that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in Righteousness,” in holy Vessels, as *Isa.* lii. 11. **הברו**, *Be ye clean that bear the Vessels of the Lord.* And I hope the Word will for the future carry the Idea of *Purification* higher than that of a *Fuller’s* (supposed) *cleansing* by the use of *Soap*, or any detergitive *Herb*; though the Doctor, p. 120. tells us, it hath not done so hitherto. And possibly this might be what our Lord meant by *washing* his Disciples Feet just before he shed his Blood for them; declaring them qualified to be admitted to the *Purification* by his Blood, who was the real *Berith* of Mankind. *If I wash thee not*, says he, *thou hast no part with me*; all being to be washed before the *Blood* can be applied; and here he is not only *like*, but really, the *Berith* **מכבים** of those that are washed. *Christ* is not the *Berith* under the Law, but shall, like that, search through and through what it is applied to. And yet he is *Berith* the *Purification*, as he is called our *Righteousness*, in the *Abstract*, the *Way*, the *Truth*, and the *Life*, all *Nouns* of the *feminine Gender*, as the Doctor imagines *Berith* to be, and objects to it on that Account. *Christ* is not *Berith*, because he is compared to the *Berith* under the Law, but because he is called so expressly, and the *legal Berith* was described to teach us what the *spiritual Berith* is: And yet had *Christ* been only compared to the typical instituted *Purification*, we might have argued that he is the real *Purification*, he being the *Reality* of all the *Types*. The Word **כבר** so misconstrued in the Text above is used in the *spiritual Sense*, *Psal.* li. 4, 9. *Wash me from my Sin.—Purge me with Hyssop, and I shall be clean, wash me, and I shall be whiter than Snow.*

There was a Place once or twice mentioned, 2 Kings xviii. 7. and Isa. vii. 3. translated the *Fuller's Field*, but more likely שְׁדָה כּוֹבֵס was the publick Place without the City, where that Ceremony was performed ; for the Priest was to go out without the Camp to them, search if they were cured, and then if they were, they were to wash themselves, and be brought within the Camp to the Door of the Tabernacle, with their *Sin* and *Burnt Offering*. And there *Isaiah* was ordered to meet *Abaz* ; when, as after a solemn Humiliation, he promised him in the Name of God, the great *Atonement* for *Sin*, the *Emanuel*, the great Compound Sacrifice for *Sin*, whose Blood was to avert eternal Destruction, a Figure of which was now given them in their Deliverance from that seemingly inevitable Destruction that hung over them from the Kings of *Affyria* and *Israel* in Confederacy against them. But to return to the Derivation of the Word, now we have seen what the Thing was.

There being a Word that signifies to purify, from whence *Purification* is derived, whatever is called by that Name, will leave but little Dispute ; nay, no doubt at all, but that it is called so, because it does *purify* ; and if it is applied to twenty different things, all of which are remarkable for cleansing, *Cleanser*, or *Purification* (in the Abstract) will be the truest Construction of the Word. Ashes, Nitre, or any other Species of Salt, Oil, Water, and Blood, may all cleanse ; and they single, or in Composition, may be used for that Purpose ; but *Berith* is neither Ashes, Salt, Blood, or, &c. though Ashes, Salt, and Blood are a *Purification*.

It is true as the Doctor shews, p. 88. that the Learned have given various Etymologies of the Root (or Meaning) of *Berith* ; or have fetched it,

one from one Root, and one from another ; and have given various Reasons for the same Etymology : As they have also given various Senses to בָּרִת, which all of them, in general, allow to be the Root of it in two Places. But what the Doctor means by the Distinction, *the Sense of Smegma, Soap, or even Purifier in general*, is not so true, because the Sense of *Smegma*, is Purification in general ; and he makes a Distinction where there is no Difference ; and would seem to weaken the Force of that plain obvious Inference, that if בָּרִת be from בָּרִת, which is agreed on all hands in the two Places above, as signifying to cleanse or purify, *the Sense of Soap* must be, and that unavoidably, *Purification*. I shall pass for the present the strict Meaning of בָּרִת, and go on to p. 95. that I may keep the same Point in View, which the Doctor calls,

“ *Vocis Homonymiā, viz. Whether Berith do really signify, always, the same Thing; or in Mr. C—’s Phrase, convey always the same Idea.*”

If the Doctor mean any thing else by *the same Thing*, than the *same Idea*, I apprehend he is mistaken, because *Purification*, or *Berith*, doth not mean the *Thing*, but the *Idea*, and that must be the first *Thing* to be settled. If he does mean the same by *Thing*, as Mr. C— does by *Idea*, which he seems to do by adopting Mr. C—’s Phrase, and a better perhaps even he himself could not have found than it is, then we are agreed so far, that *Berith* is not *Soap*, but *Purification*; and this he also seems to allow of p. 88. where he acknowledges, that *the Context, Jer. ii. 22. and Mal. iii. 2. will oblige us to give it this Meaning, viz. Soap or the Means to wash away Uncleanness*. And therefore shall proceed in the Question *de vocis Homonymiā*.

The Doctor says,

“ 1. Let it be observed first, that we have as good Authority for its bearing different Significations

“ nifications in Scripture, as we have for any
 “ one.—If the Context requires that it should
 “ be twice rendered by a Cleanser ; the Context does
 “ also in a great Number of Places, require that it
 “ should be rendered by Covenant, or *some Word*
 “ *that is equivalent.*”

Here I join Issue, *by some Word that is equivalent* ;
 and pass over the Middle of the Paragraph, that
 “ If we have the Authority of the LXX, and
 “ all the Versions, Commentators and Lexico-
 “ graphers, for its signifying *Soap*, or *something*
 “ *that cleanses* in two Passages, we have their Au-
 “ thority also for its signifying *Covenant*, in two
 “ hundred other different Places.”

Because it is not to the Purpose, not only from
 what is said above ; but because of the Concession,
 that we have their Authority only for its signifying
Covenant, or *something equivalent*. Now, if cut-
 ting off a clean Creature in order to cleanse with its
 Blood the Person admitted into the Covenant of
 God ; and bind Persons by the Hopes of that *Pu-*
rity or *Purification*, to keep their Contracts in Mat-
 ters of Consequence, with each other, and making
 them One, by partaking of the same Blood, were
 customary, then *cutting off a Purification*, or in
 more familiar, though not more expressive *Eng-*
lish, *slaying that which is to purify*, is equivalent to
making a Covenant, because it was (with the *Alah*)
 actually making the Articles of Agreement to be-
 come a Covenant, or binding both Persons to the
 Observance of them, and was uniting them by that
 Blood in the Bond of Friendship. That they did
 really *sometimes* slay a clean Creature and purify
 themselves with its Blood at making Covenants,
 is certain, *Psal. l. 5.—those that have cut off my*
Purification by Sacrifice, or translate it the other Way,
those that have made a Covenant with me by Sa-
rifice, either way, this Text will incontestably
 prove

prove that *Covenants* were made or *ratified* by slaying a Creature in Sacrifice; which Text I do not recollect to have met with in Doctor Sharp's *Dissertation*, though it seems to have deserved a Consideration. If the Doctor admit Mr. C——'s Interpretation of ברית in this Text, the Dispute is over; and if he adheres to his own, which is the usual one; it proves that a *Covenant was made by Sacrifice*, which looks so favourably towards the *H——n Notion*, that joining in a Sacrifice together, or jointly killing it, and sprinkling themselves with its Blood, was understood, as equivalent to making a Covenant, and became a common Phrase to that Purpose; it looks I say, so favourable to our Notion, that, I hope, it will abate a little of the Prejudice, which the *Novelty* of the Interpretation hath raised against it; and take away the Handle the *Uncommonness* of the Expression hath given this learned Adversary of ours so rhetorically to flourish upon; for how rhetorical so ever it is, it is in reality no more than Flourish.

Jer. xxxiv. 18. Evidently makes *cutting off the Berith*, and *cutting off the Calf* the same Thing,—*The Berith which they cut off before me, the Calf which they cut in twain*; the English puts in, *when*, and transposes the Words, but without any Authority from the Text. From the Context we learn that the King of *Judah*, his Nobles, and all the People, had, at the Instigation of *Jeremiab*, agreed to let their Servants go free, according to the Law; a solemn Promise is made to that Purpose, and this Part of the Law is as it were *re-made*; it was resolved it should now become a Law for the future; this Covenant or Agreement of the People is, as usual on solemn Occasions, confirmed or ratified by a Sacrifice; they slew a Calf, or young Bull, cut it in two, and passed between the Parts. The

Blood of the Calf was, [as appears by the Custom, though no other Particulars, then joining in the Death, and passing between the Parts of it together, be mentioned here,] saved in a clean Vessel, and the Parties sprinkled with it. So that they bound themselves to let their Servants go free, by this solemn Act, the Sacrifice that represented *Christ*, in the *most* Particulars perhaps of any, sprinkled themselves with its Blood, so *purified* themselves; so reconciled themselves to God; so made themselves one with God by the Blood of *Christ*, ver. 10. *and they obeyed, all the Princes, and all the People, that came into the Purification* (that is, all that were sprinkled with the Blood, and that came in between the Parts of the Calf) to *let every one his Servant go free*. But they thought worse of it afterwards, and forced them to return to their Slavery again; and therefore God threatens them with Destruction for it. Ver. 16. *Ye turned and polluted my Name, and caused every Man his Servant to return into Subjection. Therefore,—I will give the Men that have transgressed my Purification, which have not performed the Words of [or that were spoke with] the Purification which they slew before me, the Calf which they cut in twain, and passed between the Parts, I will even give them into the Hands of their Enemies.* It is plain that they made or renewed, as we call it, their Covenant with God by the Death of the Calf; and slaying *Berith*, and *slaying the Calf* are in so particular a Manner set together, in *Apposition*, as it were, in the *Hebrew*, though not in the *English*, that I see not how the Inference that slaying the *Calf* was slaying *Berith*, is to be evaded. And here again we see that the Covenant was made by Sacrifice.

The young Bull or Calf that was cut off to ratify the Covenant, just above, was the Sacrifice that was made at confirming the whole Law, or admitting all

all the People into the *Covenant of God*, or to speak more intelligibly, into his *Purification*, at *Sinai*, *Exod. xxiv*. The Particulars of which it is worth while to dwell a little upon. Verse 3. *Moses came and told all the People all the Words, of the Lord, and all the Judgments — and Moses wrote all the Words of the Lord, — and read them in the Audience of all the People : And they said all that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient.* Here is God on one side and the People on the other, God gives in his Terms, and the People unanimously and gladly accept them ; so the Agreement is made, after this *Moses, ver. 4. offered Burnt-offerings and Peace-offerings of פָרִים young Bulls to the Lord, and Moses took half the Blood, and put it into Basons, and half of the Blood be sprinkled on the Altar ; the other half of the Blood be sprinkled on the People and the Book, and said behold the Blood of the Purification, which the Lord cutteth off with you upon all these Words.* The Blood of the young Bulls, (one for each Tribe) is divided, and half of it sprinkled on the Altar on God's or Christ's Part ; and the other half is sprinkled on the Book and the People. Both are purified with the sprinkling, and made one, by being covered with the one Blood. As many as were sprinkled with the Blood, were made clean by it, and were *all one in Christ. Rom. v. 10. When we were Enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the Death of his Son.* Ver. 1. *being justified by Faith we have Peace with God. Eph. ii. 13. Are made nigh by the Blood of Christ. For he is our Peace, who hath made both one — having abolished in his Flesh the Enmity, the Law of Commandments — for to make in himself of Twain, one new Man, making Peace, and that he might reconcile both unto God in (by) one Body thro' the Cross, having slain the Enmity thereby, or by himself. Col. i. 20. Having made Peace thro' the Blood of his Cross — you that were some time alienated, and Enemies — now hath he reconciled in the Body of his Flesh thro'*

through Death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his Sight. Heb. ix. 13. If the Blood of Bulls and of Goats—Sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the Flesh, how much more shall the Blood of Christ purge your Conscience? Purification is the grand and leading Idea, and the important Particular pointed out in the sprinkling of the Blood; Reconciliation, Union, doing away Enmity, or making Peace, is but a Consequence, tho' a necessary one. *The Book of the Purification* is the Terms on which God was pleased to consent to the slaying of the young Bull, and purifying them with its Blood; the *Book* and *all the Words* differ only as one is the *Words spoken*, and the other *written*: *Those Words* are all that can be called the Agreement, League, or Covenant; and *upon them*, because of them, (*by Marius de Cal. præpositio pro natura Orationis exponitur*—propter) was the Type and original *Berith*, both cut off; and to shew it here, the Blood was sprinkled *upon* the Words. The Book of the Purification (take the Word either for the *Agent* or the *Action*) is no more than the Words spoke or wrote, on which God was pleased to make Peace, or be made one with them, by sanctifying them. The Blood was the Type of *Christ's* Blood; the Death of the Creature, of *Christ's* Death. The representing the cutting off of *Christ*, and so-shedding the Blood that purifies the Conscience, was the Motive, on which God admitted them into Terms with him, there could be no other; *for there is no other Name under Heaven given among Men whereby we must be saved*. Cutting off the Creature was the Covenanting Act; the Consideration on which, and the Act by which, they were admitted into Covenant with God. Slaying the Creature was saying in *Actions* what *Alah* does in *Words*. And it was usual on these Occasions of coming into the Covenant with God, or ratifying one between Men,

Men, to use both. Cutting off the Creature in a typical view, or as a Sacrifice yielded them that which purified them typically; cutting off of *Christ* yielded that which purified in reality; and he could not have purified others, or have been a Purification to them, had he not been cut off. It was by his Flesh, by his Body thro' Death, thro' the Cross, that he was our *Purification* and our *Peace*; see the Texts above. The Blood of the Creature was reckoned the *וְגַם*, the Body of it, or itself, and the Blood was what purified. And since *Christ* was represented here, and the Purification by his Blood the grand Circumstance marked out, and he being expressly called *Berith*, as well as his Influence on the Soul compared to the Influence the strongest Cleansers have on the Body, there can remain no Doubt but that the Sacrifice might be called *Berith*, as well as him it represented: Names being common to the Type and Antitype; to the Picture or Person it is drawn for. And if *Cærath* to cut off be proper with *Calf*, it is with *Berith*; because the Creature was the typical *Purification*, as *Christ* is the real *Purification*. And the same Word shall express, as is so common in Scripture, both the *thing*, [in the *Abstract*] and he or it through whom we receive it; our *Righteousness*, our *Peace*, our *Life*, our *Salvation*, and so here our *Purification*. *Berith* was a proper Term for the Sacrifice on these Occasions, because it was to exhibit the *Purification* of *Christ*, which only can qualify us for *Peace*. It was their being made clean by *Christ* that God accepted their Acknowledgement of in the Death of the *Calf*. It was the Hopes of that great Mercy, and the Fear of the Curse which *Christ* was made, when he was cut off for us, that laid the Restraint on the Mind.

As the Propriety of this Ceremony, which marked out our *Purification* and *Peace* with God in *Christ* at making Covenants, hath appeared, as I hope, from considering the Meaning of it; so will the Propriety of

of the Word בָּרְךָ, whence *Berith* comes, appear beyond any other Word used for *Cleansing* in the Bible, if we consider that, as *Alab* is a general Word and includes all the Curses in the Bible, and in Nature; so is בָּרְךָ a general Word, and includes all the *Cleansers* in Nature, and what is expressed by all the other Words put together. It is *clean*, in whatsoever manner made so; by Fire, by Salt, by Oil, or Water, or by any other Means. It is free from Spot, Stain, Dirt, within or without, *Blemish*, Imperfection, as Dross in Metals, or Sin in Man, מְרַקָּה, טְהָרָה, רְחָזָה, נְקָה, בְּבָסָם, צְרָפָה and besides בָּרְךָ are the Words used to something of like the Sense; but they express only the different Manners or Ways of Cleaning. חַטָּא is to miss a Mark, to err, to sin; and is to expiate or atone for, by *substituting* something in the Sinner's stead. טְהָרָה is to acquit or declare *Clean*. רְחָזָה to dip or plunge in Water. בְּבָסָם to wash Cloaths, though used to washing the Heart. נְקָה to be *clear* or void of a Thing, Crime, or Dirt. *Leigh*, *Vacuus*, *Mundus*, &c. נְזָה liquid, limpid as Oil, clear. נְזָה to run, as melted metals so clean. *Leigh*, *fudit*, *fundendo*, *purgavit*. צְרָפָה is to search into, as Fire does what it melts. מְרַקָּה is to rinse, rub or scour. בָּרְךָ is the Effect of all, made clean by any way whatsoever. *Isai. i. 25. I will melt out בָּרְךָ to Purity thy Dross.* It is applied to Weapons, either *new cast*, or rubbed bright, made clean; to Things or Persons, either as picked or culled out, or which are without Spot or *Blemish*, so perfect; to Words in making a thing plain or clear, to declare; not simply, speaking or telling a thing, but to illustrate or make plain, *Ecc. ix. 1. All this I put to my Heart, to declare all this, not barely to say it; but to make it clear and plain; to clear all this.* This Sense of בָּרְךָ makes nothing for them who interpret *Berith* with respect to talking; a Covenant is not an *Explanation* or clearing up of any Point. Nor does picking out or culling, taking the best

best from the worst, if it do signify so, make any more for them who fetch it from בָּר Selegit.

“ Because covenanting implies Choice both of Persons and Terms.”

I may chuse whom I will bargain with, and what Terms I will bargain on, in many Cases ; but this chusing is not the Sense of בָּר, which is culling out good from bad, *i. e.* *cleaning* what is so culled out ; and seems to have very little Relation to agreeing or covenanting, even among Equals, much less betwixt God and Man, where the *Covenant*, if it be proper to call it so, is the Terms given in, and Benefits conferred upon Submission to them. I do not find that בָּרָה is ever used in the *Bible* for *cutting* or *destroying* ; בָּרָא, which is another Word, is once or twice construed so, and by *Elige* twice. There is no Proof at all that בָּרָת is from בָּרָה ; nor does the construing it so, make Sense, I mean, as it appears to me, Gen. xxxv. 16. There was yet בָּרָת, as it were, a Segment to come to *Epbrath*.

בר is construed to *chuse*, 1 Sam. xvii. 8. Goliath says, בָּרוּ for you a Man, read this, *sanctify* for you, or *purify* a Man, and let him come and fight with me ; it would carry the Spirit of the Challenge further, as it implied a Contempt of them and their God together. בָּרוּם is, 1 Cbron. vii. 40. *et al.* applied to the Heads of Houses, who as first-born were sanctified, holy to God ; or, it may mean here, *clean*, perfect-made Men. So 1 Cbron. ix. 22. and xvi. 41. and Neb. v. 18. *Six choice Sheep*. These are all the Places where the Word is usually construed by *chuse*, though the LXX construe it so in some others, as Psal. xviii. 27. *with the chosen thou wilt be chosen* ; in our Translation *with the Pure thou wilt shew thyself pure*, and the Context and Sense both, I think, give it the Preference. Those then who fetch בָּרִת from בָּר, and would give it any other Signification than

than *purify*, *pure* or *clean*, either did not see the Idea in the Word, or did not attend to it; but gave a Latitude to the Word in some Places, where the one simple Idea, *clean*, will make the best Sense; though possibly one Word, may not make the best *English*, as we call it, in all Places. בָּרָה to eat is set up by the Doctor, as the *Radix* of *Berith*, which I shall postpone till I come to it in order, because I am only now endeavouring to clear the Idea of בָּרָה, and shew that, if it be the Root of *Berith*, it must mean *Purification*, and not *choosing*, *Declaration*, or, &c. provided the Derivative has the same Idea in it, its Root hath; which if it has not, it might as well be derived from any other; and the Dispute about its Radix is losing Time.

There are several Particulars insisted upon in the preceding Pages, which I will set down in separate Articles:

1. That *cutting off a Berith*, was slaying a Creature in Sacrifice.
2. That cutting off a Berith was equivalent to making a Covenant; though it was not agreeing upon what Terms the Covenant should consist of.
3. That the Creature cut off was called *Berith*, because it was what they purified themselves with. It yielded those Materials which sanctify to the purifying of the Flesh, and was cut off for that Purpose.
4. That it was proper to call the Covenant-Sacrifice by the Name of *Purification*, because they purified themselves with it, that by it they might be made one with God, and with one another. As *Christ made Peace through the Blood of his Cross*,—and them that were

sometime alienated, and Enemies in Mind by wicked Works, yet now hath he reconciled in the Body of his Flesh through Death.

5. That *Christ* is expressly called *Berith*, the Creature therefore that was his Type must be a *Berith* in the same View, though not to the same Degree. And besides, the Use made of the Creature when slain, the slaying *Berith*, and slaying the *clean* and *cleansing* Sacrifice of the Calf, are made equivalent or synonymous.
6. That *Berith* is the properest Word in the Hebrew Tongue, as a Name of the typical, or of the spiritual Purifier, as it is so general a Word, and expresses the *cleansing* by all the many *typical* or *real* Cleansers in whatsoever manner made use of.

These Considerations, I flatter myself, if they cannot be disproved, will put an end to our Dispute; and it only remains now, as far as I can see, to apply what has been said, to the Exceptions taken against our Notions on this Head by the Doctor, and which I shall proceed to do with all the Conciseness I can.

The two hundred other Places in the LXX, which render *Berith* by Covenant, having all changed Sides and come over to us, and admitted the Word *Purification*; we come next to a Mistake of the *Examiner Examined*, who says, *We have the Authority of the LXX, that Berith is derived from a Verb that signifies to purify.* To which the Doctor replies, p. 96.

“ No; you only have their Authority, that “ *ברית* in two Passages, signifies *Soap*, or some “ *deteractive Herb*.”

I say, Yes; we have their Authority that it signifies *Purification*, because *בר* signifies to *purify*, which we have their Authority for. And though

they

they have misled us, as far as they possibly could, by translating *Berith*, πυα (and others) *Soap*; yet they could not conceal the *Idea* in the Word; and no doubt the Eye of Providence guarded the Word in this and one Place more, that it should not be possible for the Ignorance or Design of Men to confound it, but that the Sense of the *Noun* might lead us to its true Radix, as the Words with it do to the Species of *Purification* intended; the Purification מכבש, of those who were cleansed from their Pollutions was not *Soap*, but *Blood*, *Oil*, *Salt*, *Water*, typically applied, in *Token* that *Christ* should apply them *really*.

Next the Doctor puts the Question to the *Examiner Examined*,

“ Where is your Authority for correcting the Sense of *Berith* in any Place, where there is no mention of washing or cleansing? ”

I apprehend it is from the Places where washing or cleansing is mentioned with it; if it is that which cleanses those who are washed; or if it be the Means of cleansing made use of by those who do wash or cleanse, then you have the Meaning of the Word; and why should not *Berith*, after that, be as able to tell us its own Meaning, without the Help of כבש as with it, as without the Help of *Berith*? *Purification* will make Sense and Truth in all Places where the Word occurs; *Soap* in but two, and but very indifferent Sense in those two. We are as sure that בְּרִית is from בָּר, as we are that *Purification* is from *purify*. And if *Purification* should occur in some Passages of any Author that alluded to Customs, which the Commonalty did not understand, we should expect the Learned should endeavour to explain the Custom, and not confound the Word to cover their own Inadvertence, or Inattention to what, on many Accounts, it might be expected they should be acquainted with.

The Doctor continues to press the *Examiner Examined*, p. 97.

" As for the LXX you have just as much Authority from them, to call what they render *ποα*, the *Fuller's Covenant*, as to call what they in two hundred other Places render *Διαθηκη*, a *Purifier*."

Not quite so much. There is no *Verb* from *ποα* to *covenant*, as there is of *Berith* to *purify*. Besides the Context doth not *oblige* us to give *ποα* the Meaning of *Covenant* in these Places, as it is allowed it does *Berith*, the Meaning of *Soap*, or, *the Means to wash away Uncleanness*: The *Fuller's Covenant* is *Nonsense*, *God's Purification* is *Sense*, and *Truth* too, in many Places; and *Purification* will do tolerably well in all Places. And the LXX might mean *Purification by Berith*, since purifying Men is the Thing promised by the *Covenant of God*; and as Mr. H——n says, the *Confusion* about the *Word* hath arisen, *by making the Word, substituted for the Thing promised to be given, stand for the Words of the Promise or Covenant*; and thereby, *they have left it uncertain what the Thing is*. It is uncertain also what *Berith* is, *Mal. iii. 2.* according to the *Commentators*, and *Versions*; for some make it *Soap*, and others *some deteritive Herb*: *Soap* is not an *Herb*; and what *Herb* is it, if it be an *Herb*? There are many Sorts of deteritive *Herbs*. It is uncertain also (for every Thing the Learned dispute about is always uncertain to the Learned) what *Διαθηκη*, the *Word* so often used by the LXX for *Berith* in other Places, really signifies; and here the Learned have puzzled themselves almost as much as they have with the *Hebrew Word*. So that it is not *beyond doubt* that the LXX meant a *Covenant* by the *Word*, though the Doctor takes it for granted they did. — *Διαθηκη, Neque Testamentum, neque fædus, neque Pactionem significat, sed prout simpliciter vocis Notatio postulat.*

Dispositionem vel Institutionem Dei. Jun. in Parallel.
 vide *Bezam in Mat. xxvi. 28.* cited by *Leigh, Crit. Sacra*, with some others to the same Purpose. And *Luke xxii. 29.* The *Verb* is *to appoint*. Now, the *instituted Means* of Purification, whether the Type or the Anti-type, is the direct Meaning of *Berith*; and if the learned Doctor had not puzzled himself, as other learned Men have done before him, almost as much with the *Greek* as with the *Hebrew* Term, it being a Credit to err with the Wise, he would have seen that the *Greek* Word is a very good one, for though it doth not convey the radical Idea in *Berith*, it leads us to that Institution which does.

Let the Doctor then keep his Fuller's Covenant to himself, and leave us either the *Purification*, or *Institution*, appointed for those that are to be cleared.

We are now to apply the Idea of *Berith* to the Word in several Passages where it occurs; and on this Occasion the Doctor allows, that where you wculd tind out the true Sense of a Word,

“ To examine its Use and Force in divers
 “ Passages, and such particularly, as seem least re-
 “ lated in Circumstances to each other,—is of all
 “ others the most unexceptionable Rule of En-
 “ quiry.”

If this most *unexceptionable Rule of Enquiry* would but justify my setting aside every Argument that depends on *mere Authority*, it would shorten the Dispute very much; but Authority is an Argument great Men are very apt to lay a Stress upon, and resent it as an Insult on superior Merit, and a levelling of all Ranks, a *destroying all Order and Decency*, when an Inferior protests against it. I gladly therefore lay hold of the Concession, that *cross-examining the Texts*, where the Word in doubt occurs, is the most *unexceptionable Rule of Enquiry* into its Meaning. Let us proceed then, and here I lay down this Preliminary, that as in Law, bare Possession

Possession is a Right till the Claimant shews a better Title, so if a Word occurs in a Place, where the Context doth not lead you to its Meaning, it shall be allowed to have that Meaning there it certainly has in other Places. To the Places now where *Berith* occurs on, in the Doctor's Phrase, the covenanting side;

" 2 Chron. xvi. 2, 3. *Aſa* ſent to *Benbadad*,
" King of *Syria*, that dwelt at *Damascus*, ſaying,
" there is a *League* (ברית) between me and thee,
" as there was between my Father and thy Father;
" go break (בריחך) thy *League* with *Baafsha*."

That this Paſſage ſuppoſes a ſolemn League or Peace ratified between *Aſa* and *Benbadad*; as also between *Benbadad* and *Baafsha*, is evident at firſt View. The Question is, whether the *Hebrew* according to us expreſſes this properly, That *Berith* was a Name for the נַעֲלֵם Calf or young Bull which they cut off in Sacrifice to purify themſelves with by its Blood; and that they might, by ſprinkling themſelves with the Blood, unite or make themſelves one by it, has been made out, I hope, to Satisfaction. As they joined in this Ceremony, or jointly performed it, it was between the two; each had an equal Hand in it. *Benbadad*, as an heathen Prince, thought not of *Christ* in the Sacrifice, as *Aſa* King of *Judah* no doubt did; he might, ought however to have done ſo, if he did not. But that makes no Difference as to the Intent of being jointly ſprinkled with the Blood, which they did as a Sign of Peace and Union. According then to this Sense of *Berith*, the Paſſage will run thus, *There is a Purification between me and thee, as there was between my Father and thy Father. Go break through, disregard, cast off from thee, thy Purification with Baafsha.* Whether *Purification* mean here the Creature ſlain, or the Ceremony of ſprinkling with the Blood, it will come to juſt the ſame. *You and I*

have joined in a Sacrifice, and purified ourselves together ; or, there was a Purifier cut off between us, as there was between my Father and thy Father. Go, break through (Leigh, *irritum facere*) look on as void the Obligation of בְּרִיתךְ thy Purifier [cut off] with *Baaſha*. Where is the mighty Improperity in this Way of speaking ? If he had said, I and you have signed and sealed a Peace, go, cancel, break through thy Hand and Seal with *Baaſha* ; Hand and Seal would not signify a Covenant or Peace between them, but would so strongly imply it, that no Body would doubt of it ; and a Man must have a pretty deal of Art and Dexterity to make it dubious what *Hand* and *Seal* might mean in other Places. This Ceremony of *joining* in a Sacrifice was certainly understood to mean something more than going to a Sacrifice *by themselves* ; they purified themselves in order to make Peace with God ; they *jointly* purified or sprinkled themselves, and the Articles of Agreement with the Blood, *doubtless* meaning something more than being barely sprinkled by the Priest as an Act of divine Service ; for *Aſa* and *Benhadad* need not have met by themselves or their Proxies to have done that. Or need *Moses* have sprinkled the Altar, the Book, and the People, if something more had not been intended further than Pardon of Sins. Dr. *Sharp* hath a Quotation, p. 90. which says, *Olim federa scissis Animalibus confirmari solebant*, from *Witsius*. Why then should it be deemed unintelligible Language between two of the Ancients to say, they had joined in a Sacrifice together, meaning they had ratified a Covenant between them, when their *joining* in the Ceremony was the usual, as well as so expressive a Declaration of Peace and Friendship ? The Doctor asks,

“ What better Translation can be found for
“ *Berit* in these Passages, than *League* ?

Why,

Why, the obvious meaning of the Word. That which explains in what manner they ratified, and by what Tye they bound themselves to the Observance of their *Leagues*.

The next Passage to be considered is,

“ *Job v. 23. Thou shalt be in League with the Stones of the Field.* **עַם אֲבָנִי** הַשְׁדָה בְּרִיחַ,—
“ and the Beasts of the Field shall be at Peace with thee,” (or as in the Hebrew, **הַשְׁלָמָה לְךָ** shall be peaceable to thee.) “ What Idea of Purification doth the Word convey here?” p. 98.

As strong a one as it does of *Covenant*? Unless you will suppose the Stones of the Field could talk and make an Agreement not to hurt him, or throw him down, when he walked over them. Translate this Passage, literally, as it stands, according to the Doctor, and it is *thy Covenant shall be with the Stones of the Field*. What *Covenant* is spoke of? *Job* had made no *Covenant*, nor could he, with the Stones of the Field. But it is a Metaphor I suppose, that the Stones should not hurt him any more than as if they had agreed not to hurt him. It is a strange and forced Metaphor, this, as it stands; and the Comment must add a great deal to make the *Language* better than the *Sense*. And not only *unnatural* to talk of Bargaining with the Stones; but seemingly unnecessary, for what hurt do they do us? they are on many Accounts extremely useful; and where they lay too thick upon the Ground may be picked up and thrown aside for Use. *Covenant* it is plain makes but a very indifferent Figure here, let us see what *Purification* will do. I shall refer to Mr. *Gittins* who in his *Answer to Mr. Bedford's Examination*, hath shewn that it makes very good Sense and Truth. He shews that **אֲבָן** render'd Stone is any thing *bound* *together*, which when the Earth is, it must necessarily be barren. God had cursed the Ground

for the Sin of Man who had filled the Earth with Violence; but, for the sake of the Righteousness of Christ, hath taken off that Curse; or thro' him suspended it, with regard to those who believe in him; and therefore thy Purification shall be with, or extend to the Clods of the Field, is, "God shall " through that Purification mellow the Ground thou " sowest, and give thee fruitful Crops." See the Passage at large, *Answer, &c. p. 34.*

Mr. Cittins's Explanation of this Passage is so easy and natural that it might have deserved a Consideration, when Mr. H——n's Construction of Berith was objected to in it; but it would waste time to cite and examine the Answers to *old stale* Objections, and swell the Dispute, and therefore it is more prudent to pass them by; a plausible Objection may be repeated, or Difficulty started in a few Words, but the Answer, which we are not obliged to own we have seen, may require a pretty many to get rid of it. But,

" Once more to instance in a Place, where
 " Carath is joined with Berith, 1 Sam. xi. 1.—
 " the Men of Jabesh said unto Nahash, make a
 " Covenant with us, (כָּרְתָּת לְנוּ בְּרִית) and we
 " will serve thee.— Nahash answered them, on this
 " Condition, will I make a Covenant with you."

p. 99.

Jabesh was besieged by Nahash, and the Inhabitants being unable to defend the Town, offered to submit on Terms, and say, " Come to a Sacrifice with us; let us be put under the Protection of that Blood thro' which we are sanctified, which is to present us holy and unblameable in the Sight of the Aleim, and we will serve thee." The Idea of purifying by the Blood, and reconciling or uniting to God, all who were sprinkled with it, and so of course to each other, when jointly sprinkled with it, are too closely connected, and too plain and

and obvious in the Title of *Berith*, provided the Word ever signifies *Purification*, to have admitted, one would have thought, of any Dispute. How this may sound in the Doctor's Ears, I can't tell; but it seems to sound Sense, and carry along with it such Evidence of its Propriety, that we may venture to let it stand, as the Sacred Writer doth, "Cut off a Purifier לְנוּ in our behalf, and we will open our Gates and submit to thee."

"How would this sound, (says the Doctor) if "read according to Mr. C——?"

And then as if thoroughly convinced it were not Sense, because not a common Phrase with us, and not understood, adds,

"Whatever may be the true Etymology, of ברית, or the ruling Sense of כרת, yet the Meaning of both Words is very plain in this Place."

I think so too, and that it puts the matter out of Dispute, that they desired the Oblation of that Sacrifice, which all looked on (together with the *Alab*) as the highest Security, and strongest Test of Love and Friendship, that could be given; and the Ceremonies in the Course of which Sacrifice, so naturally exhibited *Purity, Union, and Reconciliation*.

"The Meaning of both Words is very plain, "and so must the Translation be; else it were no "Translation,"

Adds the learned Gentleman, which no doubt is true; but then *short Phrases*, that allude to known Customs, cannot always be translated *totidem verbis*, so as to convey the Idea to those who do not understand what the Custom was; or who have not annexed that complicated or *complex* Idea to a Word or Phrase, which they who first used it did. And if the Scripture in one or two Places explain a Custom at large, those Places, ought, as they were designed, to be looked on, as Definitions of the

single Word or Phrase in other Places. Neither will any Language answer to the *Hebrew*. Its Conciseness and Expressiveness are not to be paralleled; the *Reader* must first be acquainted with the Rites and Ceremonies of the *Law*, and the Meaning or Propriety of them, before Allusions to them, or Phrases about them, will be understood; Points these, which our learned Christians now-a-days, think not worth their Pains; and imagine they are employed more in Character, while they are endeavouring, under the Shelter of that Ignorance, to confound Explications, that may be Sense and Truth, for aught they know to the contrary.

The Doctor goes on,

“ I shall content my self with having proposed these three Texts,” yet chuses not to be contented with them, but proposes three more in the same Breath; where, if what he says were but as strongly supported, as it is asserted, that

“ In none of them can a Sacrifice be supposed to have intervened, or been solemnized between the Parties,”

The Dispute would indeed be over, and *cutting off a Purifier*, could not mean *cutting off a clean Creature to purify themselves with its Blood*.

The Places are,

“ *Josb.* ix. 6. Where the *Gibeonites*, by *Craft*, make a Treaty with *Joshua*; 1. *Sam.* xxiii. 18. where *David* and *Jonathan* enter secretly into Covenant in a Word; and 2 *Chron.* xxiii. 1. where *Jeboiada* strengthens himself by taking the Captains into Covenant with him.”

First, the *Gibeonites* by *Craft* make a Treaty with *Joshua*; might not they desire the same Security the Men of *Jabesh* did, above? Was it not highly probable that such a Sacrifice should be offered for them, when they came on purpose to acknowledge the God of *Israel*? And how could they acknowledge him, that is, by what publick

Act in those Days but by Sacrifice? and were no Covenants formerly confirmed by Sacrifices? See various Quotations to this purpose in the learned Work before us, p. 90. et seq. *Olim fæderæ scissis animalibus, confirmari solenniter solebant — in fæderibus semper aliquid exscindebatur & occidebatur — in fædere sanciendo cæderentur victimæ.* I shall cite one or two more; *την εἰρηνὴν ορχούσις καὶ σπονδαῖς βεβαιώσαι.* Herod. l. 4. Peculiariter σπονδαῖς dicuntur libationes quæ fœderibus et induciis sanciendis adhibentur, et frequentius sic ipsæ induciæ et fœderæ appellantur intercedente libatione sancita, ut Xen. Hell. 3. ποτεραὶ βελεταὶ σπονδαῖς εγχειν η πολεμον. Sic et apud Thuc. Plut. Herodian, &c. see *Scapula*. This was not confounding the meaning of σπονδαῖς; *does he chuse a Sacrifice or War?* is as intelligible, as *will be have Peace or War?* σπενδομαι *Scapula* construes, sacrificor, mactor, et immolor. *Euripides* uses σπονδαῖς τεμνειν, because cutting the Sacrifice was the *Oath in Action*; so *Plutarch*, *εὐλετο δια σφραγιῶν ορκωται τῷ εὐλην*; *to bind by a Sacrifice in an Oath*, shews that offering the Sacrifice, and cutting it in Pieces, was looked upon as *making an Oath*; and was a Covenant in *Action*, as ours are now made in *Writing* by Signing and Sealing. With what Appearance of Truth and Propriety doth the Doctor then assert, that *in none of the above Instances, can a Sacrifice be supposed to have intervened*; and consistently with himself remark,

“ Or, if such Rite or Ceremony may be supposed, “ (as what may not be supposed, when one hath a “ mind to it, that is not impossible?) yet it amounts “ to no more than a groundless Supposition.”

This is not the first Time, by several, that the *Note* and the Text contradict each other, and therefore there seems some Reason to suspect that they are from different Hands. I do not pretend to guess who the *Notes* were added by, but it is evident the Au-

thor of the Text, and the *Annotator*, looked different Ways ; or each contrary to the *Apostolical Rule*, on his own things, but not on the things of the other, to see how they would quadrate. If *Covenants* were formerly *always* attended with *Sacrifices*, why should it be called a *groundless Supposition* to say that such a Rite or Ceremony intervened between *Joshua* and the *Gibeonites* on so solemn an Occasion, and to the *Gibeonites* of that Consequence and Importance ? And it looks as if the League between them was confirmed in the *never-failing* customary Way, (see the Citations above) since God, so many years after, as in the Days of *David*, revenged the Breach of this Publick and National League so severely on the Family of *Saul*, who may be supposed to have been enriched with the spoils of the *Gibeonites*, whom, it is said, he slew, *He and his bloody House*, in his Zeal to *Israel*. And there is very good Reason from ver. 15. to conclude, had we met with the Phrase in no other Place of Scripture than this, that making a League or Peace was something different from *cutting off a Berith*. *Joshua made Peace with them*, and cut off a Purifier for them ; and the *Princes of the Congregation sware unto them*, laid themselves under an Execration to keep it. *Making a Peace* and *making a League*, are so much the same thing here, and the Tautology so flat and unnecessary, that it may justify my putting in the Claim of *prior Possession* in the behalf of בְּרִית, as signifying what the Words do elsewhere. And I hope the Doctor will soften a little his Reflection, that the Supposition of a *Sacrifice*, on this Occasion, being solemnized between the Embassadors of a (supposed) great Nation, and the *Princes of Israel*, is supposing something next to *impossible*. And I appeal to the learned Person whose useful Notes on this Head, I return my thanks for, whether it is *impossible* to suppose that there was a *Sacrifice* here.

The

The next Text is,

" 1 Sam. xxiii. 18. Where David and Jonathan
enter secretly into Covenant in a Word."

The Text says nothing about their doing it *secretly*. Jonathan it is likely concealed his going down to David from his Father Saul, and had Sense enough to see that his Father was fighting against God, who had decreed the Kingdom to David, and though Heir-apparent himself to the Crown, gave up all hopes of the Succession; but was willing to secure himself and Children a Share in David's Affections; *thou shalt be King over Israel, and I will be next unto thee*, says he, and that also *Saul my Father knoweth*; and they two יכרתו ברית before the Lord. Chap. xx. 8. David says to Jonathan, *thou hast brought thy Servant into the Berith of Jehovah with thee*; which seems to make it probable, that *Carath Berith* between them was something different from *making a Covenant* between them, since it was bringing him into the *Berith* of God with him. And this looks favourable to our Construction, that *cutting off a Berith* was doing some Act that *united* them to God and to each other at the same time, which I presume it will not be said a bare League did do; but *sprinkling* each other with the Blood of *Berith* most certainly did.

" The Translation says, *Jonathan went down to David into the Wood.*" And I suppose *in a Word* in the last Citation from Dr. Sharp is a false Print, for *in a Wood*, "*David and Jonathan enter secretly into Covenant in a Wood.*" If their being *in a Wood* is to justify the *Secrecy* and *Privacy* of the Covenant, that it can't be supposed that two Persons *who were slid off into a Thicket*, that they might not be seen, should have an Opportunity of offering a Sacrifice, if that were the Reasoning designed, I shall be sorry for the *Erratum* of the Press, but do not think it has done much damage; for in the first place,

place, there is no great reason to think that **הרשה**, where *Jonathan* went down to *David*, was a Wood; but a Place so called; and if it were, it would mend the matter very little. It was where *David* and seven hundred Men had their Dwelling; who no doubt had Tents and Cattle for themselves, their Wives and Children. *Abiathar*, the High Priest, was there with *David*, who had an *Ephod*. How then was it secretly and in a Wood that they made their Covenant? There is not the least Hint of these two retiring into a Wood to keep it a Secret, which seems to be the Insinuation designed.

The last Passage is,

“ 2 Chron. xxiii. 1. Where *Jeboiada* strengthened himself by taking the Captains of hundreds into Covenant with him.”

Jeboiada took the Captains of hundreds with him into a Purification. Neither *Jeboiada* nor his Commentator were in a Wood here, but in the House of God, and therefore it might have been the more readily allowed, that the High Priest might make them join in a Sacrifice with their young Prince and himself, as he had made them Confederates in his Design of restoring him to the Throne of *David*; and so bind their Allegiance to him, the only Hope of the House of *David*, by that solemn Tye, which the Blood of Christ upon them laid on their Minds. And the Danger was great, and the Occasion was worthy, for which they should give the most solemn Assurance of their Fidelity, when such a Woman as *Abihailah* was upon the Throne of *David*; and that House to which the Promises were made had been extinguished with the Infant Life of this young Prince. ver. 3. All the Congregation with the King in the House of God; and He (I suppose, *Jeboiada*) said unto them, behold the King’s Son shall reign, as the Lord hath said of the Sons of *David*. What more natural than

to suppose, that the High Priest offered a Sacrifice upon such an Occasion, and sprinkled the King and the People with the Blood, and passed them between the Parts of it, and so bound them to each other, according to the Custom, and put them under the Protection of Almighty God, who was pleased to bless the bold Attempt of the High Priest, which reflected no less Honour on his Courage and Conduct than it did on his Faith and Allegiance, with the wished-for Success? Is it next to *impossible* now to suppose that such Rite or Ceremony should intervene? or is the learned Gentleman consistent with himself, when he says so, and yet tells us, where it *seemed* to serve his purpose, that *Covenants* were never made without it?

I think the Reader will too easily see into the Meaning of such Sarcasms as the last upon his Opponents, which I have cited above from the Doctor at large, and here refer to, in p. 100. But I question whether he may so easily find out the Meaning or Propriety of what follows;

“ *It is no Evidence or Proof* (much less Proof beyond all Contradiction) and consequently not sufficient to determine the Propriety of Words used on these Occasions.”

What is no Evidence or Proof? What doth *it is no Evidence* refer to? Doth it mean that the *supposing a Sacrifice to have intervened* in these last Instances is *no Proof, much less Proof beyond all Contradiction*, of the Meaning and Propriety of the Phrase in Dispute? If it means not that, I know not what it means; if it does; let me ask, who ever supposed it was Proof? or offered it as such? But I must say, when it appears so positively that slaying or cutting off a Calf, dividing it, passing between the Parts of it, sprinkling themselves and the Articles of Agreement with the Blood, was customary at the ratifying of Covenants, and the whole Transaction is called

called *cutting off Berith, the Purifier or Purification*, to dispute the Meaning of the Phrase in the Places where it is not explained at large, merely because it is not so, too plainly shews that some People have got it into their Heads that they have Abilities to carry, and Licence to attempt the carrying, any Point in dispute they please.

We are now to enquire,

“ 3. Whether *Berith*, when it is rendered by “ Διαθήκη and *Fædus* may not have some further “ Signification still differing as much from the Idea “ of *Treaty*, as of *Purification*.” p. 101.

They talk of the Copiousness of the *Arabic*; this Word may even rival any in that rich Tongue. I have often wondered that your *Arabians* could not find out its Radix in *Arabic*, that they might lay claim to so copious a Word.

“ I should scarce have mentioned this further “ Distinction in the Use of *Berith*, if there had not “ appeared in Scripture, some pretty remarkable “ Grounds for it. *Jer. xxxiii. 20. If ye can break* “ my Covenant (ברית) *of the Day*.—*Ver. 25. If* “ my Covenent (ברית) *be not with Day and Night*; “ *if I have not appointed the Ordinances of Hea-* “ *ven*.—Now in these Places ברית seems to sig- “ nify the same with קֹד a Statute.”

It seems somewhat unnecessary for the Doctor to seek for any other Sense of *Berith* here than *Covenant*. Since God might as well make a *Covenant with the Day and Night*, in the behalf of Man, as with the Beasts of the Field, see *Hos. ii.* speaking to the Church, ver. 18. *In that Day, אֶכְרַת לְהָם בְּרִית, will I make a Covenant for them with the Beasts of the Field, and with the Fowls of Heaven, and with the creeping Things of the Ground.* I suppose the Doctor will allow that *Berith* is not *Ordinance or Statute* here, because *making a Statute or Ordinance with the Beasts*, is not Sense; any more than

than making an Ordinance *with* Day and Night is; though appointing the Ordinances of Heaven is; but here *Berith* is not the Word for *Ordinances*. Why need he then endeavour to thicken the Mist he had so happily spread over the Word before? It looks, if one could suppose such a Thing, as if the Doctor was not so thoroughly acquainted with the Use of the Word in Scripture, as no doubt he is. The Covenant of God, with *the Day*, for Man, and his Covenant for them *with the Beasts*, may be reconciled with little Trouble; and both with as little to Mr. H——n's Idea of *Purification*, as may be seen in Mr. H——n, in his Comment on these Texts. I do not plead the Authority of the *Translations*, *Commentators*, and *Lexicographers* against the Doctor's Construction of *Berith* in the Texts above, only observe, that *there are some pretty remarkable Grounds* for correcting them all in some Instances, according to this learned Gentleman himself; and I flatter myself that a Man of his Candour and Ingenuity will allow us the same Liberty he is pleased to take himself, of passing them all by, when we think there is Reason to do so.

Berith has another Signification still, p. 102.

“ Further, as *Berith* is found (*happily*) to signify “ an Ordinance, so is it used sometimes simply for “ a *Command, Præceptum.*”

And the Authority of *Herm. Witsius* is quoted for it in the *Note*, who refers to *Jer. xxxiv. 13, 14.* for it. *Tbus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, I made a Covenant with their Fathers in the Day that I brought them forth out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondmen, saying, at the End of seven Years, let ye go every Man his Brother an Hebrew.* This and many other Precepts were given them at that Time, when the Covenant of God was made with them: Or, to speak in the Language of the Text, this was one of the Words on which

which the Blood of the Purification was sprinkled, in order to ratify it as one Article of the Covenant. And *Witsius* might mistake the Meaning of *Berith* in *Jer. xxxiv.* as so many other learned Men have the Meaning of it in *Jer. xxxiii.* which the Doctor hath given us *some pretty remarkable Grounds* to conclude they have in the preceding Page. But the Doctor cites,

“ *Deut. iv. 12. The Lord spake to you out of the Midst of the Fire, and ye heard the Words, and he declared unto you בריתן את which he commanded you to perform, even ten Commandments, and he wrote them upon two Tables of Stone.*”

He declared unto you his (Berith) Purification, is, as may be seen in many Places, *he declared unto you the Words of his Purification*, *Exod. xxiv. 7. Moses took the Book of the Purification*, and read it to the People, and then *sprinkled the Book and all the People*. And said, *Bebold the Blood of the Berith, which the Lord your God hath cut off with you upon all these Words*. To declare the Berith is no more nor less than *declaring the Terms or Conditions of it*, which Terms they were to perform; and *Berith* may signify either *Purification* or *Covenant*, for any thing that the Phrase, *declaring his Berith*, can determine about it; for if it be translated *Covenant*, *declaring his Covenant* can be no more nor less than *declaring the Terms or Conditions of it*. The Law, or even a principal Precept of it, and more particularly the *Decalogue*, as an Abridgment of the whole, may very properly be called the *Book, or the Words of the Berith, Purification on God's Part*, as Faith and Obedience were the Terms of the Purification, on the People's; but this doth not at all affect the Sense of *Berith*, as applied to that typical Blood they were purified with, on giving their Assent to the *Law, or all the Words of it*,

it, or as applied to *Christ* the *real Purification*. God spake Words, and the People promised Obedience, as cited above, and then *Moses* slew the Sacrifice, and purified the People with the Blood of the Type of Christ, the *Berith of the People*. So that the *Words of the Purification*, may, without any great Violence or straining the Matter, be understood to be those Words, Terms or Conditions, they submitted to when the *Berith* was cut off. Those Words are the *Precepts* or Laws of God, an Epitome of which was written on two Tables of Stone, which are called the *two Tables of the Berith*, meaning of the *Words of the Berith*; and the Ark, the Ark of the *Berith* Jehovah, either because *Jehovab* the *Berith* was himself exhibited in *Person* upon it, or for the Reason the Doctor gives, they being deposited in the Ark: But still *Berith* is not the *Words it was cut off upon*. *Berith* is here what the LXX translate it *Διαθηκη*, the *Institution* of God; and that *Institution* was *Purification*.

We are now to shift the Scene from the *Vocis Homonymia* to its Radix again. And here two Points are to be closely attended to.

“ 1. That supposing בְּרִית and ברית to be both deduced from בְּרַר, yet it will not follow, that the *Idea of Purification* is the ruling one in both “Derivatives,” Anglice in the same Word.

“ 2. That בְּרִית and ברית, may come from different Roots; the one from בְּרַה, as regularly and grammatically, as the other from בְּרַר. And consequently that there is as good Authority for the one, as for the other.” p. 105.

If it may, we must try each Place where the Words occur, to see what Root has the best Claim, for I take it for granted that if bringing it from this Root makes Sense and Truth; and bringing it from that Root makes Nonsense, the first will be

deemed to have the best Authority on its side. The Places produced by the Doctor, I have examined on the *purifying Side*; we shall presently see, if any can be brought on the *eating Side*, that I may borrow the Phrase, for בָּרָה is construed to eat, what *Idea* soever we may fix to eating.

These Points we are to attend to, the rather, because the *Examiner* Examined taxes Mr. Bedford with not attempting to derive Berith from some Root, that had the Idea of Covenant in it; or giving some Proofs from *Facts*, *Circumstances*, *Context*, &c. It was a reasonable Demand; and I hope I may again say, that I expect the Doctor himself will shew some *Connection in Sense or Idea* betwixt the Root and *Derivative*, the *Noun* and the *Verb* he fetches it from.

We have already seen, as the Doctor says, p. 106, how far *Facts*, *Circumstances* and *Context* require the Sense of *Covenant* in many Places; and I suppose those brought by this Gentleman on the *covenanting Side* were what he thought most likely to determine the Point in his own Favour; which whether they have or no, may not be quite so clear a Point, as he seems to think, when he says, p. 105.

“ If what has been said——be truly said, as I
“ think it is, but leave it nevertheless to the Judg-
“ ment of the Reader, &c.”

Come we now to the *Radix* of the Word. First, “ בָּרָה has two Significations, besides that of
“ purifying, which give it a Pretence to be the
“ Root of Berith, viz. declaring and abusing.”

The Sense of declaring the Doctor drops, and chuses to consider only the latter.

“ בָּרָה in the Sense of *eligere* occurs in Scrip-
“ ture much oftener than in any other Sense
“ whatever,” p. 107.

I cannot find this to be true. *Marius de Cat.* construes it twenty-eight times in the Sense of *mundus, purus*; and but four times in the Sense of *eligere*: as doth also the interlineary Version of *Pagninus*; and our own Translation, except at 1 *Chron. xvi.* 41. where (as also Chap. ix. 22.) *purified* bids fairest to be the Construction, since they were always *sanctified* or *purified* before they could enter upon any holy Office in the Temple. But the Doctor appeals to the *LXX* for the Truth of his Assertion, that

“ בָּרָר in the Sense of *eligere* occurs in Scripture much oftner than in any other Sense whatever, as may be seen by the *LXX's Version of it*, in *Con. Kircher, or M. de Calasio, Ed. Romaine.*”

As if the *LXX* Version were to determine what was the Sense of Scripture, and what occurred there oftener, occurred in Scripture oftener. The *LXX* has translated בָּרָר in the Sense of *eligere* oftener, I believe, than any other *Version*, and in some Places, where it scarce makes Sense, as 2 *Sam. xxii.* and *Ps. xviii. 27.* *with the Chosen thou wilt be chosen.* And *Job xxxvii. 11.* οὐ εὐλεκτούς καταπλασσει νεφελη, which may have a Meaning, though I cannot guess at it. But suppose the *LXX* had rendered it oftener in the Sense of *eligere*, why must that Version Rule the Sense of Scripture? It would be tedious to cite all the Places where the Word occurs, and it must be left to the common Sense of every Man to judge for himself; to me *pure* appears the only natural Sense in above thirty out of the thirty-six Texts you meet with it in, and in many Places of the *LXX*, you must understand εὐλεκτος to mean *choice* or *excellent*, i. e. without *Blemish* or *Spot*, to make Sense; and that comes under the *Idea* we would fix to בָּרָר. *Leigh Crit. Sacra, בָּרָר*, “ The Hebrew signifieth *pure* and *clean* from *Filthiness*, *purged*, *polished*, *severed* and *select* from others, so the Greek εὐ-

“ poundeth it *elect* or *chosen*, *Cant.* vi. 9. and the
“ Word is used for *Choice*, *i Chron.* vii. 40. *Neb.*
“ v. 18. and elsewhere, as also for purged by
“ Trials and Afflictions.” *Buxtorf’s Concord:*
Purgare, purificare, seligere ut purum. The *Scholar’s*
Companion, by *A. R.* בָּר *purus, pure, clean,—innocent,*
spotless, without Filth,—without Mixture,—
elected, picked out, from elicio.

To *chuse*, will not be found the leading Sense
of בָּר, but to purify; one way of which is by *separating from Mixtures*; which is done when you
take your Choice, or pick out good from bad, or
take forth the Precious from the Vile; but in many
Instances, nay in general, to *chuse* doth not suppose
such a Separation; only *taking first*. And therefore
purify will include *chuse* in it; but *chuse* will
not include *purify*, which ought to be observed.

The Doctor cites three Authors in the Note, to
support the Question,

“ Whether the Sense of *eligere, secernere, &c.*
“ be not prior in order to that of *purificare, mun-*
“ *dare, &c.*—It is commonly first given in the
“ *Lexicons and Concordances.* See *Pagnin, Kir-*
“ *cher, Nathan, &c.*”

Pagnin makes the Sense of *purificare* the chief and
leading Sense, see his Versions of the Word in his
interlineary Version, and it is commonly first given in
the *Lexicons and Concordances*, see *Buxtorf, Hulsius,*
Leigh, Munster, and Cubus Hebræo-Latinus, by
E. H. G. &c. and even בָּר *filius, according to some,*
is to be referred to the same Original. בָּר *idem quod* בָּן
filius. Prov. xxxi. and Psal. ii. Ubi tamen quidam in-
terpretantur נָקֵד mundum, purum, Seb. Munst. Nay,
even בָּר frumentum, according to some, is to be refer-
ed to the same Original also. בָּר Frumentum, Triti-
cum, a Puritate, Buxst.

But, secondly, we are to come to what is thought
more material, viz. the Derivation of בְּרִית from
בְּרָה;

ברא; and here are no less than eight Authors quoted for it, who suppose that ברא signifies *selegit*; whereas it is *not once* construed so in the Bible, nor can it be construed so, unless you seem to do as Leigh seems to do, make *chuse* and *eat* the same Thing. ברא elegit — *parum modicum edit, aut carpit ex cibo quocunque*, Leigh, Crit. Sac. in English to *piddle*, or pick a Bit here and there. There is one Misfortune upon all these Gentlemen, and which sets aside their Evidence in the present Case, and that is, that they have mistaken ברא for ברא, and so they do not fetch ברא from ברא, but from ברא which is another Word. The Doctor, I should think, could not help seeing this, and yet he says,

“ Other Persons, and those not unskilled in the Language, have found the Derivation to come more *regularly* and *naturally* from ברא, which hath accordingly been approved of for its Root.”
p. 108.

And the *Appendix* to these *Dissertations*, by way of Reply to the *Defence* of Mr. H——n’s *Plan*, which says, that *Marius de Calasio* derives *Berith* from ברא to *cut off*, answers,

“ No; *M. de Calasio* only says, that *some* have derived it from ברא, *Quidam dicunt, &c.*”
p. 147.

And here he stops, which was prudently done, because if he had given the Citation, instead of referring to it, it would have appeared that what the *Defence* said was true, that it is ברא and not ברא, which *Calasio* gives (indeed from others) as the Root of *Berith*. *Quidam dicunt* ח mutari pro, ut Radix sit ברא *juxta illud*, *Ezek. xxiii. 47.* וברא אותהן et succidet illas. So *Buxtorf* in his *Concordance* construes ברא *eligere* and *exscindere*, and refers to five Places, in every one of which the Word is ברא. And in his *Lexicon*, —*ברית a quasi a*

tel **ברא** *de quo in ברא*, &c. So that this whole Group of Authorities, unluckily, turn on my side, and prove, as far as their Authority can go, that **ברה** is not the Root of **ברית** ; since they make **ברא** the Root of it. And the next Question will be how the **ב** comes to be dropped ; or whether any one Instance can be produced of the like Derivation, as this of **ברית** from **ברא** is supposed to be.

The Lexicographers having changed sides in this Dispute about the Derivation from **ברה** ; it is asserted next, that,

“ If any regard is to be had to the common Methods of Derivation of Words from Roots of the same radical Termination with this, hath ten Claims to be the Root of where **בר** hath one.”

And you have a List of Names, to the Number of eleven, to support the Assertion. The Doctor hath taken the Poll for himself, and given himself a great Majority ; but I demand a Scrutiny. But first we may reduce the Number to seven or eight, for three, if not four, of them are what we call *Faggots*, Names without any Body to answer to them. **המיה** doth not occur, *Prov. xviii. 19.* and *Prov. i. 24.* the Word is **המיה**, the Plural of **המיה**, as *Isa. xiv. 11.* is in *regimine*, or the *Genitive* of **המיה** referred to *Jer. xi. 16.* is, and **דליות**, *Deut. ii. 36.* is, **קרית**, and though doth occur elsewhere, it is in *regimine*, the Noun being in the *Nominative* **בריה**, and formed as **בריה** *Meat*, is from **בריה** to eat. And so is **לוית**, *Prov. i. 9.* in *regimine* also, **לוית חן** *Copulatio Gratiae*, from the *Verb* **לוה**, and formed as **בריה**, **המיה** and **קריה**, **המה** and **בריה** ; and instead of being Examples for the Doctor’s Derivation of *Berith* from **ברה**, entirely overthrow it ; for in all the Instances, where the **ח** is *radical*,

radical, the Noun is formed in יְהָ and not in יְתָ ; though the ה in reg. is changed into תָ.

And now to the Point, whether the remaining Instances are proper Vouchers for the Derivation of בְּרִית from בְּרָה, which, I think, they are not. But as some general Qualification must be laid down, or we shall have no *Rule* to go by, I shall take that which the Doctor gives us in the Words above, *viz. the radical Termination* ; if then the seven remaining Words, בְּכִית, חֲנִית, &c. should be found not to have the *same radical Termination* with בְּרָה, then they are not qualified to vote on the Doctor's side ; and by the same Rule, if they have the *same radical Termination* with בָּרָ (which I beg leave to propose as the proper Root, and not בָּרָר) then they will be on my side, like the *Authors* just now, though supposed to be otherwise. I propose בָּרָ for the Root, and not בָּרָר, because one ר is as many as we want, and as many as Usage gives it, in near thirty Places out of the thirty odd the Word occurs in. But perhaps we shall have a Dispute what shall be deemed the *radical Termination* ; for here I must own, the *Lexicographers* are in general against me ; and have, out of an odd Whim, given a Number of Words an ה radical, which do not appear to have any Claim to it, as בְּכָה, to weep, &c. I do not know whether the Distinction of the *mutable* and *immutable* ה, in the first of these learned *Dissertations*, can be of any Service to me on this Occasion ; it is certain however, that the ה in all these Words produced by the Doctor is not *immutable*, and consequently not radical upon that Account. You find some of them oftener without it, than with it, and all of them as often. The Letter ה, is in many Instances changed into ת, in *regimine* ; is supplied by a *Jod* ; and perhaps understood in וְתָ, the plural Termination, *fem.* and *infin. Mode* ; in all these Cases there is some Rule

to go by, in calling for the absented **ה**; but if the **ה** be ever entirely dropped, neither supplied, nor changed into any other Letter, and this very frequently, what Rule have you to make it *radical* by? Or, why do you suppose it dropped? Thus, e. g. **יבך**, *he wept*, and **תבחך**, *she wept*; why is **בכה** to be the Root? Why not **ברך**? If the **ה** be radical in **בכה**, then **ברך**, **יבך**, &c. must be from another Root; or from another Word which hath not so many radical Letters, and is without the radical **ה**. Now either say that there are two Roots, **ברך** and **בכה**, which both signify to *weep*, or that the **ה** is not *radical* in **בכה**; or shew us some Rule by which the *radical* may be supposed to be dropped; and till that is done, this Word must be struck off the Doctor's List; and at most will be on neither side. But if you say, that they are both from the same Root, then the **ה** is not radical, because it does not belong to **ברך**, **יבך**, &c. and this Word will be an Instance to support the Derivation of **בריה** from **בר**, in Opposition to **ברה**. That the **ה** is often dropped in the Derivatives of all the Words produced by the Doctor, is very easily seen in any *Concordance*, and thither, I must refer the Reader; which is neither *artful*, nor a *Transition*, from the *Dictionaries* to the *Concordances*, as the *Appendix*, p. 149. is pleased to call the like Reference to the *Usage* in Scripture. I appeal here from the *Dictionaries* which make the **ה** *radical* to the Text, where you will find that the **ה** is not *radical*; if Usage of the Word by the Writers in *Hebrew*, is to determine what is *radical* and what not in a Word; instead of the meer Fancy of Lexicographers. And I refer to the *Concordances*, as the Reader may see there at once, how the sacred Writers writ the Word, when all the Passages, it occurs in, are before him together. It is true, as Mr. C—— said in his *Answer*, p. 51. “ That

" the Lexicons and Concordances not seldom take
 " the Liberty to insert the **ח** (and other Letters
 " too) in Words where it is not *radical*, and the
 " Grammars have formed Rules to strike it off
 " again." And therefore I appeal to the Text,
 and Usage by the inspired Writers, and I do it
 with the less Reluctance, as it is not a Matter of
 Judgment but of *Fact*; and any one, who hath got
 the Use of his Eyes, is as able to distinguish an **ח**
 from an **א**; or whether a Word has an **ח** at its
 End or no, as the best Writer that ever lived; I
 appeal therefore to the Text, and there we find
 these Words, without the **ח**; though now and
 then the **ח** is retained where it doth not seem to
 be directly *servile*, as if it stood for a Sign of the
 feminine *Gender*, or, &c. בָּרָה, construed to *eat*,
 never drops its **ח**, except it have some *Affix*, or be
 in *regimine*, as 1 Sam. xii. 27. *He did not, eat*
Bread with them. Chap. xiii. v. *let her*
give me to eat, ver. 6. and אָבְרָה, *I will eat.* Here
 is a very remarkable Difference in the Usage of
 בָּרָה, and seven of the nine Words, the Doctor would put
 on the same Footing. They seldom retain the **ח**;
 however in vast numbers of Places are without it;
 but בָּרָה never drops its **ח**, but where it may be
 supposed *sunk*, in the *Affix*; it is the same with
 the **ח** in לָוָה and אֱלֹה, and therefore till we are
 better informed, we may call the **ח** *radical* in
 בָּרָה, לָוָה, אֱלֹה, נָגָה, גָּבָה
 חֲנִית, חֲמִית, בְּכִית, דְּלִיוֹת,
 עֲלִית, &c. The Sum of what is now
 brought together on this Head is this, that
 in most of the eleven Words, in which the Doc-
 tor supposes the **ח** to be *radical*, it is not so;
 the Derivatives therefore in יְתִ from them, are
 Authorities for Mr. C——'s Derivation of
 בְּרִית from בָּרָה; and the Remainder, where the **ח** is
 radical,

radical, shew by Parity of Reason, that the Noun from ברה ought to be, as we find it is, בריה, and not ברית. Which (Berith) according to the common Methods of Derivation must come from ברה and not ברה. The Defence had made this Remark before, p. 89. “Had been the Root, the Noun would have been בריה; this your Friend knows, and his Concordance will shew him several Instances of בריה for the Noun, (viz. for *Meat*) but not one of ברית.” The *Apologist*, in his *Appendix* to these *Dissertations*, is pleased to reply to this,

“Here is an artful Transition from the Dictionaries to the Concordances; for this Gentleman knows, as well as the *Apologist*, that altho’ ברית is commonly put under ברה in the Dictionaries when it is read *Berith*,— yet both *Nathan* and *M. de Calasio*, in their Concordances (and *Buxtorf* too in his) have put it under ברת. So that in these Concordances no *Berith* but only ברה appears under בריה.”

Then see if you can find ברית for *Meat* under ברת, and it shall be allowed the same as if it was found under ברה; for that was what the Defence referred to the Concordances for, meaning the Texts of Scripture, which stand together in the Concordances. בריה is a Noun used for *Meat*, but never *Berith*; and this will appear to any one who consults the Concordances, where he will see all the Texts together, where ברית and בריה occur. Whether the Appendix purposely misunderstood the Defence I can’t tell, but the Answer is as wide of the Point in Question, as if it was purposely done.

The *Apologist* asks next,

“What is gained by this Observation to Mr. H—’s Sense or Derivation of *Berith*? ”

Why

Why this; that בְּרָה to eat, (and there is no בְּרָה to Abuse or Cut off) is not the Root of it, and therefore there remains only בָּר for its Root.

But to return to Dr. Sharp,

The Doctor I am sure must allow me this Liberty of appealing from the *Lexicons* and *Grammars* to the Usage in the Text itself, because it is a Liberty he takes himself against Mr. C—— in his Counter-Construction of אלהים אלהים and אלהים אלהים; and because as I said it is about a Matter of Fact, which a little Man who has the Use of his Eyes can judge of as well as the Great Man himself can do. And Frischemuth's *Scales*, (vid. note p. 109.) have got bad Weights in them, for neither is the ח in the supposed Root of שְׁבָה radical, it being without the ח, Deut. xxx. 3. et al. nor does בְּרָה signify legit; I do not mean in the *Dictionaries*, but in Hebrew.

And what the Doctor himself asserts, that

“ בְּרָה from בְּרָה (or rather from בְּרִית) is a Deflection so uncommon,” is an Assertion not guarded with that Caution the Doctor commonly guards what he says, for the three Instances in the Note, are alone sufficient to shew it is not uncommon; many Nouns being formed by the Addition of ח to them. I had instanced in from כתית from בְּרָה (the Lexicon Root for כתה; גְּזִית) besides כתה which are too many Examples to call from בְּרִית an uncommon *Derivation*; and the Doctor hath now helped me to a great many more; and so I leave this Head.

It is commonly thought necessary that a *Noun*, and the *Verb* it is derived from, should have the same Idea in them; and therefore the Doctor inserts a Caution,

“ If it be asked, whether the Root בְּרָה, have the Idea of *Covenant* in it, I cannot say it hath; neither is it necessary that it should.” p. 109.

But perhaps some People may think it necessary we should have been told why; for if there be room to mistake the *Root* or *Verb* a Noun or any other Derivative comes from, the Sense used to be looked upon as a very good Guide in the Enquiry. If a School-Boy were bid to construe *occidit crambre repetita*, the Sense would be deemed sufficient to justify him in making *occidit* the *Verb Trans.* and not the *Verb Neuter*.

בְּרֵה it is allowed hath not the Idea of *Covenant* in it, tho' *Covenant* be supposed to take its Name from it; and this is excused by saying, it is as good a Derivation as many others, that are assigned in the Dictionaries.

There is as good Connection between *Covenant*, and the usual Senses of בְּרֵה to *cut*, to *chuse* (which it never signifies) to *eat*, as is to be found in many other *Derivatives*, with the Roots that are assigned them."

Which is no Reason why we should not, but the very Reason why we should look further. The strange, forced, and far-fetched Derivations and Accounts of Words so common to be met with in the Lexicographers, require our looking further, and by other Rules than they have done.

That we may have no reason to think there is any Certainty in the *Hebrew*, after בְּרֵה is proved to be *regularly* and *naturally* the Radix of בְּרִית, (where every Body but a Man of Sense and Learning, would have looked for the same Idea in the Derivative, as in the *Radix*,) after this, בְּרָא puts in its Claim;

Neither would I exclude as unreasonable and improbable the other Deduction of *Berith* from בְּרָא, *creavit, ordinavit, exscidit.*"

If it comes *regularly* and *naturally* from בְּרֵה, how can it be *reasonable* and *probable* that it should come from בְּרָא, which is another Root?

I shall not enter into the precise Meaning of בְּרָא; it not being necessary here; only shall ask by what Rule, Usage, or Authority, the נ comes to be dropt, if בְּרָא be the Root of *Berith*. And here, though I do not presume to prescribe Rules to my Betters, I shall venture to say, that if a *Buxtorf*, or a *Frischmuth*, or a *Schultens* was to be cited, for such Usage, it is reasonable first to examine, whether they may not have mistaken the Instances they would support such Usage by? It not being prudent to talk after another without considering what he says, or fair Reasoning to say, such a Point is proved, merely because some Body with a hard Name hath said so before. The Bible contains all the *Hebrew* we have preserved, and that lays in a short Compass, and may be examined with little Trouble.

There is no Certainty still, that is certain.

“ None of these Derivations are so far out of the Way, as many others commonly to be found in the *Hebrew* Lexicons; though none of them may be said to be absolutely certain. However בְּרָא stands a better Chance to be deemed the Root of *Berith, Covenant*, than בְּרָה, both from the common Form of Derivations, &c.” p. 110.

Nay, then we shall never agree, if this be said seriously; since there is not a single Instance produced, or pretended to be produced, to justify בְּרָה, as a common Form of Derivation from בְּרָא. There is not one Example brought to this Purpose, and there are many given, and some allowed of, of *Berith* from בְּרָה.

“ — And the Consent of the Versions antient and modern.”

The *Versions* have but little to do in determining this Dispute, since it is allowed that the Root hath not the Idea of *Covenant* in it.

“ — And

“ —— And the general Suffrage of Men learned
“ in the Language,”
Who all give it against בָּרָה, and have not so
much as attempted, as far as appears, to shew, how
אֶבְּרָה can be its Root. The Conclusion is,
“ And these will ever have their proper Weight
“ against *novel Opinions.*”

The common Form of *Derivations* ought to have great Weight; but the Consent of the Versions can have none; and the Suffrage of learned Men usually has more than its proper Weight with the Learned; and is all that I fear in the present Argument: though I hope the great Variety of Sentiments among them, and the different, as well as *indifferent Accounts*, it is allowed that many of them have given of this and other Words, which, *ex confessu*, are far out of the Way, I hope will abate of the Prejudice taken against Mr. H——n, for striking out into a quite different Road from them all. The Dispute here against the Learned, cannot so properly be said to be about the *Derivation*, as the Sense of *Berith*, for they have always agreed that בְּרִית is the Root of *Berith*, Purification; and so the Novelty objected to Mr. H——n, does not concern the Derivation, so much as Construction of the Word, where others have supposed it to signify *Covenant*; and if the Doctor produce one single Instance where it necessarily signifies the *Words of a Covenant*, I will allow it to have another Root. I acknowledge that it does signify *Covenant*, but not the *Words of a Covenant*, and say, that *Purification* was *Covenant* with the Antients, as, I hope, hath been proved.

The Sum and Conclusion of the whole Matter, which we have in p. 110. the Doctor gives, as the Reader might expect, in his own Favour, and then proceeds to shew, that Scripture will not be better understood should *Berith* be allowed to carry the Sense of *Purification* throughout. And yet Scripture must be

be better understood by it, if restoring that Sense to the Word shews what their Covenants were, or how made. The first Instance is,

“Obad. vii. אֲנָשִׁים בְּרִיתְךָ, the Men of thy Confederacy,” p. 112.

Altered by Mr. H——n into, *Men of thy Purification*, which is as good *English* as the other. The first means *Men joined with thee in a Confederacy*; the latter, *Men joined together by a Purification*. The first Phrase only says, they were leagued together; the latter supposes *that*, and tells you by what *Act* they were bound together.

The *Wife of thy Purification* is as good Sense, as *Wife of thy Covenant*, p. 113. and more likely to be Truth; it not being likely that a *Covenant* or mutual *Consent* between the Parties only made them Husband and Wife; but highly probable, that they testified their *Consent* at a publick *Sacrifice*, and were *united* by that Blood which makes the Union betwixt God and his Church; and of which *Matrimony* was and is a *Mystery*.

The next Text from Isa. xxviii. 18.

“ברִיתְכֶם אֶת מוֹתָךְ, your Purification with Death shall be disannulled, and your Agreement with Hell (the Grave) shall not stand.” p. 113.

Is cited, as (the latter Part of) it stands in the *English*, and *Agreement* put in *Italicks*, to point it out as corresponding to *Covenant* before; but the Doctor could not but know, that *חַזְוֹת* doth not signify *Agreement*, but *Vision*; and though the Word is diversely explained in this Place, as *M. de Calasio* says, and by some construed *Agreement*; yet it is plain they construed it so, because they did not know what to make of *Vision* there; or perhaps because of *Berith*, which they took for *Covenant* in the former Part of the Verse. Whether *חַזְוֹת* be the *Inspection* into the Entrails of the Sacrifices, by which they pretended to prognosticate, or it be the *Vision*

Vision they expected in their prophetick *Dreams*, matters not a great deal; either way their *Purification with Death*, and *Vision with the Grave*, will imply they had used some superstitious Rites to avert Death; and foolishly pretended to prophecy about it. Or rather, if you look in the *Context*, they had endeavoured to secure themselves against the *overflowing Scourge*, God threatened them with, by the reconciling Sacrifice of Purification, either offered to *Death*, or a God they supposed could avert Death; and had encouraged one another by pretended *Visions* and favourable *Answers* about it. They could as easily sacrifice to Death, as make an Agreement with *him* or *it*. But God tells them, ver. 15. *Because ye have said*, we have sacrificed a *Purification with Death*, and *with the Grave*, עשינו חזה, have we prepared a Seer, when the *overflowing Scourge* shall pass through, it shall not come nigh unto us—your *Purification with Death* shall be disannulled, and your *Vision with the Grave* shall not stand. The Translation, which is not always exact, is often of Service to an Argument at first View, when a little Examination will shew, that what the Stress is laid upon, is perhaps, only the Translators Inaccuracy, Addition, or Variation from the Text, as this was the Case with the last, it is so with what follows:

“ 1 Kings xx. 34. Then said Ahab, I will send thee away with this Purifier, or with this Purification.”

In the *Original*, בברית אשליך is, I will admit thee, or bring thee into a *Purification*. שליך is to send; with מן it is to send from; with ב it is to send to; and to bring into or send into, are proper, as observed before, because the Parties in a *Covenant* were to enter between the Parts of the *Sacrifice*, and receive the Blood upon them. *Ben-badad* had lost a Battle and his whole Army, and was

was for making Peace upon any Terms, and says, *The Cities which my Father took from thy Father, I will restore; and thou shalt make Streets for thee in Damascus, as my Father made in Samaria;* Ahab catches at these Terms, and answers, *I will admit thee to the Purification.* Not, *I will send thee away with this Purification, or with this Covenant,* which are equally Nonsense, for he could not go away with one or the other. How far catching at such Innaccuracies in the Translations may be deemed consistent with the Candour and Ingenuity of a fair Adversary, the Doctor is a better Judge than I am. For my part, I suppose this, and all the rest of the same Kind to have proceeded from the Regard to our Translation, which these *Dissertations* are so careful to pay it, except in an Instance or two.

It is acknowledged, that

“ *Cutting off a Purifier in Sacrifice, under the Notion of its being a Representation of the grand Atonement, would not be a disagreeable Sense;* if there were but Proof, that *Berith* signifies at any time the Victim, or typical Purifier.”

This is a candid Confession, and if there be not Proof that *Berith* signified the Victim, we must drop the Construction contended for.

“ In the mean Time (says the Doctor) I observe, that were the Victim in a Sacrifice at any time called *Berith*, yet the Idea of *Purification* would arise from the *Fact*, and not from the *Word*.”

p. 114.

So that proving the Victim to be called *Berith* or *Purifier*, would be lost Labour, if there be any Reasoning in this last Observation, that the *Idea would arise from the Fact, and not from the Word.* But pray, what should hinder the Idea arising from the *Word*, if the *Word* signified *Purification*, as seems to be allowed for the present? If *Berith* ever signify *Purification*, and the Victim be called by that Name, and the

Idea do so naturally arise from the Fact, will not any Body think the Name was given it for that Reason? And then all that is contended for hitherto drops at once; for the Name *Purification* is given the Victim by Supposition, and that Idea naturally arises from the *Fact* of making it a Sacrifice, as is granted; who then could hinder us putting the Idea in the *Word* and the Idea in the *Fact* together, since they are the same? Or why should not the Idea of *Purification* arise naturally from the *Word* here, since it brought that Idea with it, (for it hath this Idea, though it is supposed to have others also) especially when the Fact so naturally leads you to it?

“ — The Idea of *Purification* would arise from “ the *Fact*, and not from the *Word*.”

The Idea must arise from the Thing, or the *Word* for that Idea cannot intelligibly be applied to it. But it seems,

“ The Victim being an Emblem of the *Purifier* “ would convey all the important Ideas, without “ any help from the *Word*, *Berith*,”

So that the properer any *Word* was as a Name of the Victim, the less Reason was there to give it that Name; and the less Reason have we to conclude they did so. It is the usual Way of Scripture, and what common Sense directs, to call the *Sign* and the *thing signified* by the same Name; and *Names* were designed to convey the leading and principal Ideas in Things to the Hearer; so that the Inference from the Doctor’s Reasoning is naturally the very Reverse of what he makes. He concludes, that the Victim was not called a *Purification*, because its being an Emblem of the *Purifier*, so naturally leads you to that Idea; and I conclude that it is highly probable from that Reason alone, that it was called so; and let the Reader judge between us. The Doctor goes on,

“ — The

“ — The Word *Berith* would remain just
“ what it is, *viz.* not easily reconcileable with such
“ an Application of it, nor easy to be interpreted
“ under such Application — ”

As if it were not easy to reconcile the giving the Title of *Purifier* to an Emblem of the *Purifier*, or interpret it under such Application; when the *Emblems* so frequently carry the *Name* of what they stand for, as it is highly proper they should.

“ — Unless it were with Reference to the
“ Covenant, made or renewed, in, and by, such
“ Sacrifice,”

Would it not then be as easy, and as proper, to interpret, *Purification* (the supposed Title of the *Victim*, or Word for the *Fact*) with Reference to the *Purification* exhibited in, or described by the *Fact* or Sacrifice; and of which they were expressing their Faith and Hopes, by sprinkling, and so purifying themselves, with its Blood? One would think the Design of what they were doing would interpret the Title to them, if so plain a Word could be supposed to want any Interpretation.

The Question that follows by way of Inference from this,

" How then would our Translation be improved,
" though we were to render *Berith* by *Purifier*?"

Is answered just above. However, let the Doctor's Text, from *Jer. xxxiv. 18.* be another Specimen, because of an Objection formed upon it. *I will give the Men that have transgressed my Berith, which have not performed the Words of the Berith, which they cut off before me, the Calf which they cut in twain, and passed between the Parts thereof.*

" If we should translate *Berith* here, and render
" it by *Purifier*, what Sense shall we make of
" transgressing the Purifier—" p. 115.

Why; passing him by, and disregarding him.
עָבֵר is to pass by, or go beyond a Thing; and
M. a. that

that is a Phrase for Contempt, and if they do not mean that by *transgressing*, I do not know what they mean. *Transgressing the Mouth of the Lord*, Num. xiv. 41. *et al.* is almost as uncouth an Expression, as *transgressing the Purifier*.

Or should we render it by *Purification*, “*or the Terms of Purification*.—How can these be said to be cut off?”

They are not said to be cut off. It is the *Berith* which is said to be cut off, — *have not performed the Words of the (Berith) Purification*, which (Purifier or Purification, for *Berith* is both the Action and the Agent) *they cut off*. But then the Question is what we mean by the *Words of a Sacrifice*?

— What Sense shall we make of the *Words of the Purifier*?”

They always declared, at cutting the Creature in Pieces, what were the Terms or Articles of their Argeement which they then ratified; and therefore the *Words of the Purification-Sacrifice*, I apprehend, mean, the Words then spoke, as I said before, at p. 118, &c. and as I see no Impropriety in it, I repeat it here.

This it seems is not clear,

“ But in our *English* Translation, all is clear and intelligible.”

It is not so clear, however, what Right they had to transpose the Words and insert *when*; as the Words stand in the *Original*, they make the *Berith* to be *λύν* the Calf, just as *Homer* Il. 7. makes the Lambs to be *ορνιτα*, l. 245.

Κρυπτες δ' ανα ασυ, θεων Φερον ορνιτα πιστα

Ἄπει Δυνεις, ουδεις ιεροντας απειδεις ιεροντας

The

* Our *English* *Homer* hath lost the *Antiquity* of these Phrases in his Translation.

The Doctor apprehends, he says,

“ The same Difficulty of a proper Translation of *Berith*, in the Sense of *purifying* will be found in other Places ; ”

And instances in some ; but as I apprehend, they are all as intelligible in this Sense, as those we have been considering, the *Difficulty being the same*, I shall pass them over and go to p. 121. what comes between having been forestalled ;

“ Again, is there any reasonable Proof to be given, that בְּרִית is applicable to a Person other-
“ wife than by way of Allusion or Comparison, as
“ in this Text of *Mal.*? ”

Yes ; direct Proof ; see *Isa.* xlvi. 6. and xlix. 8. cited with other Texts, *Trinity of the Gentiles*, p. 371. *I will give thee for the Berith of the People.* There can be no directer, or more reasonable Proof of a Matter of Fact, than a Sight of the Fact itself, and it is allowed in the preceding Page,

“ That the Sense of a Purifier will very well stand here, there is no room to dispute.”

But

315 Mean time the Heralds, thro' the crowded Town,
Bring the rich Wine and *deftin'd Victims* down. POPE.

269 ορκία πίστα Θεών αυταρία, (which we may translate, *tby brought the faithful Juratoria, sacred to the Gods*, meaning the Lambs) is omitted in *Pope* ; and in other Places he conforms to our Phrase, as l. 105. οφέ ορκία ταῦτην αυτος, he translates,

145 Let rev'rend *Priam* in the Truce engage,

And l. 252 — ορκία πίστα ταῦτα, he renders,

L. 321. To seal the Truce, and end the dire Debate,

In all which Places, and several others, it is the *Lambs* are spoke of under the Title of *ορκία*, which we have no Word for in *Englis*, and so I hope it may be excusable to make one, *viz. Juratorium*, like *Pagninus's Peccatorium* and *Culpatorium*, above.

But whether it will or no, here is a reasonable Proof that *Berith* is applicable to a Person, besides the Comparison in *Malachi*, because it is so applied. The *Addenda* to these Dissertations of Dr. Sharp's, p. 161. have taken up this *Query* of the Doctor's, but play upon the Point in a quite different manner, and with a quite different Spirit, and so much in the Stile and Manner of the *Modest Apology*, that one cannot mistake the Author. He cites from Mr. H——n's *Trinity of the Gentiles*, Part of what he finds the Application of the *Berith* to *Christ* upon. Mr. H——n brings *Jer.* and *Mal.* to settle the *Idea* of the Word ; and many Texts, see p. 371. to justify its *personal Application*. BIO

The Author of these *Addenda* should have fairly stated Mr. H——n's Argument, which he has not done, as the Reader may see, since here is no Citation from, or Reference to, p. 371. of the *Trin. Gent.* where the Texts are produced to shew the Application of this Title to the Person of *Christ*. After this *prudent* Representation of the State of the Argument, he tells us,

" There is an obvious *Query* to be put here, *viz.*
 " Whether the Noun *WN*, *Fire*, (to which also
 " *Christ* is compared) when it stands single, when
 " no mention is made of a *Refiner*—may be un-
 " derstood of a *Person*, either of a *Refiner* in ge-
 " neral, or of *Christ* the *Refiner* of Souls—?
 " whether it must always convey the *Idea* of refi-
 " ning *Metals* or *Spirits*? "

Had Mr. H——n made *Berith* signify a *Fuller*; then might it have been asked, if *Fire* signifies a *Refiner*? *Christ* is compared, in *Malachi* to the *Berith* of the *Fuller*, and to the *Fire* of the *Refiner*; and Mr. H——n is made, by this Author, to argue, that he is therefore the *Berith* itself; but upon what Authority or Parallel would he infer that *Fire* must signify a *Refiner*? or insinuate that it fol-

follows from Mr. H——n's way of reasoning? He is so pleased with it, that he repeats it again in other Words, without observing that it is but what he had said before,

“ Or lastly, whether we may say of this Noun “ שׁ (be meant מְצַרֵּף) what Mr. H——n says of “ בְּרִית, (mut. mut.) that it signifies as an Agent “ the Refiner, &c.?”

And pursues it through several Pages; he goes on, p. 163.

“ If *Berith*, by virtue of its Reference to the “ great *Purifier* in this Text, denotes more espe-
cially *Christ*, and his Religion, throughout the “ Old Testament, שׁ must do so too, for the “ same Reason —”

He means, as I suppose, because he is also compared to *Fire* in it: But *Berith* doth not denote *Christ* and his Religion, by virtue of its Reference to the great *Purifier* in this Text, but the Meaning of the *Word* appears by its Application in these two Texts to what *cleanses*, and thence we learn that it signifies *Purification*, and in one of the Texts has no Reference at all to the great *Purifier*, but may stand for that Idea when applied to him, since he is the *Purifier*.

But *Christ* is also *the Fire of the Refiner*, as Mr. H——n is supposed to say, and therefore it will follow, that *Fire* must denote *Christ* too throughout the *Old Testament*, says this Author. Wherever it is applied to *Christ*, as *Berith* is, it will certainly denote him; but where it is applied to other Things, it cannot. *Berith* stands for many Things, as I have shewn, and doth not always denote *Christ* throughout the *Old Testament*, and it is a little Mistake in point of Truth, to say it doth so; and arguing, as the Author does, upon these Positions, that *Christ* is *Berith*, merely because he is compared to it, and that it always denotes him, according to Mr. H——n,

are Mistakes that must be corrected. *Fire* may furnish us with several Ideas from its *Condition*, its *Effects*, *Activity*, *Manner of acting*, &c. From all which it has Names in Scripture; but whence *vn* is borrowed, or what Idea it conveys, has not yet been shewn; this Author however hath not done it, by making it signify to *refine*, which he hath no Authority for. And we need not alter our *Translation throughout*, to restore the lost Meaning of *vn*; at least till we have got it. It is true that

“ Fire in this Text of *Malachi* is as fully applied
“ to an Agent, as *Soap* is by Mr. H——n’s Ac-
“ count—.”

But nothing follows from hence; but that *Christ* may be compared to *Fire*, or be called *Fire* in other Places, as he is *Berith*.

“ Yet neither *Fire* nor *Soap* are otherwise applied
“ to the great *Refiner* and *Purifier* of *Souls*, than
“ by way of Comparison —.”

So far is true; what follows is of a Piece with the above,

“ — Just as *Coriander-Seed* is applied to *Manna*,
“ *Exod. xvi. 31.*”

Coriander-Seed is not applied to the *Manna*; it was like *Coriander-Seed*, white; it is its Colour, which is compared to that of *Coriander-Seed*; and in this respect it was the *same*. And as the effect of *Christ’s Blood* on the *Soul* is compared to the Effect of *Fire* on *Metals*, and of *Cleansers* on the *Body*, or other *Things*; in this Respect they and he are *the same*; *Purifiers* all of them.

“ — As a *Flower* is applied to a *Man*, *Job xiv. 2.*”
A *Flower* is not applied to a *Man*, only the Shortness of the Duration of the Life of *Man* is compared to the Shortness of the Duration of a *Flower*; *he cometh up like a Flower, and is cut down; he fleeth also as a Shadow, and continueth not.*

“ — As *Milk* or as *Cheese* are applied to the
“ Person of *Job*, *ibid x. 10.*”

No. The Comparison is betwixt the *Manner* of the Formation of *Job's Body*, and the *Manner* of making *Cheese*. *Hast thou not poured me out as Milk*, viz. is poured out; and *cruddled me as Cheese*, is cruddled.

The Inferences the Author would parallel to Mr. H——n's,

“It doth not follow, because Man cometh forth like a Flower, and fleeth like a Shadow, that therefore either יְמִין or צָל, in other Places, may denote a Man,”

Are neither such as Mr. H——n makes, nor what the Text justifies; though these, and many others of the like Nature, will justify Mr. H——n's Conclusion, that as *Christ* is to be like the *Purification* of those that *wash*, it means like it in a *spiritual Sense*, for in that View is the Comparison stated; he that hath the like *Quality* with any thing else, has the same. So the *Duration* of a *Flower* is comparatively the same, as that of *Man*; but *Man* is not for that Reason a *Flower*. The *Modest Apology* (see p. 14. and *Answer*, p. 27.) twists the plainest Comparisons from the Point in View, and argues in the same *ingenious Way* the *Addenda* do here, that I think we cannot mistake the Author.

I shall now return back to the *Dissertations*; We were at, p. 121. after endeavouring to shew that *Covenants* will stand in several Texts, where rendering *Berith*, *Purifier*, would not be disagreeable, the learned Author proceeds to give his Reasons *why it might not be rendered otherwise*. The First is, p. 145. that *St. Paul* writing in *Greek*, used the *Greek Words* other People did, for the *Hebrew ones*, and expounds the *Blood of Berith*, by αἷμα τῆς Διαθήκης. The learned Gentleman doth not care to enter into the Reasons assigned, why the *New Testament* did not chuse to correct the *Translation* of the *Hebrew Words* and *Phrases* in *Use in Greek*,

Greek, or give us a better Translation of them ; and yet doth not care to give up the Argument from its Use of such Greek Words or Phrases : It made a good Figure in Mr. Bedford's Disputation, and seemed to have pinned down the *Hebraists* to the Sense of the *Greek* ; but as the Objection is *satisfactorily* answered, it should not have been repeated. *Διαθηκη* was the Word most commonly used in *Greek* for *Berith* in *Hebrew*, and the Apostles, it is allowed, had *Reasons* for not giving us a better Word, could they have found one, in *Greek* ; but this it is thought will not do here,

“ For St. Paul has *actually altered* the Version here, and for *Διεθετο*, which is the Word in the LXX, has put *ενετειλλετο*.”

But he has not *mended* the Version here, or given us a Word which the LXX doth not use for *כְּרָת*, in other Places, see p. 137. Nor does one *Greek* Word express more than the other ; one signifies to *command*, the other to *appoint*, but neither of them signify to *cut* or *cut off*. It cannot be said, that *ενελλομαι* comes nearer the Sense of *Carash* to *make*, than *Διατιθεμαι*, which is the Word profane Authors used with *Διαθηκη* ; and therefore if St. Paul *bad actually altered the Version here*, he hath not mended it, (which is what we say it was not proper he should) much less given us the exact Sense of the *Hebrew*. This is labouring so hard to evade what cannot be answered, that it is enough to make one think, *non persuaderis etiam si persuaderis.*

But, Secondly,

“ And which is more remarkable, our Saviour himself has used the same Expression *αιμα Διαθηκης* in the most solemn Form of Words, Mat. xxvi. 28.”

He has so ; and alluded, as I doubt not, to the *Blood of Berith* in the *Old Testament*. The *Blood of a Beast* being under the *Old*, and *Wine* under the

New

New Institution, the Blood of Christ. The Greek Word used here for Berith, is as proper a Word as any, or perhaps the best, in the Greek Tongue. It was in use; it was understood; and though as much a Misconstruction of the Hebrew, as Covenant is of the Greek, and more so; yet had he taken upon him to have formed new Words, he must have wrote a Dictionary, or explained them by a Circumlocution; and then those Words might have been disputed about, and as much misunderstood as the Words he designed to settle the Meaning of. And when all had been done, could he have given us better Words by his Apostles than he hath given us by his Prophets? And if the Authority of both Testaments is equal, there will be as much Reason to construe the Greek by the Hebrew, as there can be to bend the Hebrew to the Greek. There is scarce an Objection that has been used in the Course of this Dispute that hath been more flourished upon, or more fully answered than this has been; and which opens a wider Field for endless Contests about the Meaning of both Testaments, with several other untoward Consequences pointed out; and yet the Doctor seems to press the Argument with unusual Eagerness.

“ Is it reasonable to suppose; if the LXX in their Translation, commonly used in his Days, dropped any thing of the Weight and Significancy, which the *דְּבָרִת בָּרִית* ought to have borne, and carried into the Minds of Believers,—”

I ask pardon for the Interruption; but I do not know that the Apostles then understood Greek at all; or that Christ spoke to them in Greek; though the Apostles, when they came to write in Greek, used the commonly used Greek Words; but the LXX Version was not made for the Jews of Judea, but for those who had lost the Hebrew, and lived elsewhere; and he might as well have been

ex-

expected to have left Directions about correcting our Translation as theirs.

“ — That he, when he was in effect fixing
“ the Sense of the Word and Thing for ever ; — ”

But what occasion was there to fix the Sense of a *Word* and *Thing*, which the *Holy Ghost* had fixed some thousands of Years before, in a Language, which if they did not understand then, they were so soon to be inspired with the Knowledge of? But to go on with the Quotation,

“ — So as none afterwards should presume to
“ alter it, would not have restored at so seasonable a
“ Juncture,—the long discarded Notion of a *Puri-
fication implied in Berith?* ”

If it ever were implied in *Berith*, nothing could *discard* it, because the *Hebrew* Scriptures were designed for the Use of all Christians in all Ages. And when Christ directed them and us to the Old Testament, to *Moses*, he directed them to the *Hebrew*, not to the *Greek*; to the Word of God, not to that of Man, which a Translation is. But nothing can prevent the Scriptures from being misunderstood by some People; or was it at all necessary, that inspired Men should correct the Errors in the publick Translations of one Age more than another? All are referred to the *Original*, and they who would presume to *alter* that, would presume to alter the Translation, even if we had one from inspired Writers; which would have been useless Labour in them to have given us, and only have served to have set the two *Originals* (for so we must have looked upon them) at a Variance, for the Languages must have differed, and bred perpetual Disputes.

This will not do, it seems, for the *Hebrew Tongue* was then, in a manner, antiquated and out of use;

“ Nor can it be easily thought, that it was necessary for his Disciples to fetch the Meaning of his divine Institution, from the Writings of Moses and the Prophets.”

No; it was designed they should have it a shorter Way; he tells them at the *Institution*, John xiv. 26. *The Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my Name, he shall teach you all Things, and bring all Things to your Remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you;* though he opened the *Scriptures* so far to them, before the *Holy Ghost* came upon them, that the glorious Scene made their Hearts to burn within them.

“ —— Especially as to the Use and Import of the Phrases and Words by him used.”

It no ways appears that he spoke in *Greek*, or that they did not understand enough of the *Old Testament* to know that the Design of that *Institution* was *Purification*, by *Blood*, and consequently that *Wine* should (by his Words) henceforth answer to what *Blood* did before? The Doctor was aware of this obvious Answer, that *Christ* might not speak in *Greek*, and therefore in the next Page, he puts the Case himself,

“ If it be said, that *Christ* talked in *Syriac*, and did not himself use the Word $\Delta\alpha\theta\eta\pi\pi$, I grant it.”

Why then did he argue upon the contrary Supposition, that, “ Our Saviour himself has used the same Expression, $\alpha\mu\alpha\Delta\alpha\theta\eta\pi\pi$, in the most solemn Form of Words, perhaps, ever delivered by him in the hearing of Man.” “ Had the LXX translated *Berith* wrong, would he not have corrected it on this important Occasion? — Is it reasonable to suppose he would not? — Leaving his own Disciples under an apparent Mistake, (about the Meaning of $\Delta\alpha\theta\eta\pi\pi$) to be conquered as they could?” See a great deal more of this

warm

warm Expostulation upon the Supposition of *Christ's* speaking in *Greek* to his Disciples, and not correcting the LXX Version of the *Hebrew*, p. 125, to 130, when at the same time it is acknowledged he did not speak *Greek*, which it is highly improbable that a Parcel of *ignorant Fishermen* (see p. 127) should understand, at the Time of the Institution of the Sacrament.

But to go on with the Passage, p. 127.

“ He had once said indeed, on a particular Occasion, *Search the Scriptures*. But would this Motion given to *sceptick Jews* justify his Conduct in leaving his own Disciples under an apparent Mistake to be conquered how they could ? ”

Is not this setting aside the Old Testament, the original Record, as of little or no use? “ *Christ* had once said indeed, on a *particular* Occasion, “ *Search the Scriptures*. ” It is but *once*, and on a *particular* Occasion, so not a general Command. The Author whosoever he is that writes here, for I dare say, it is not the same we have had hitherto, seems to look upon it, as a certain thing, that the Direction to search the Scriptures, when there were none but the *Hebrew*, concerned not the Disciples of *Christ*, being directed to *sceptick Jews* only ; though one would be apt to think, that if *Christ* referred even *Scepticks* to the S. S. for Evidence of himself, the honest, well-disposed Disciple must be able to find that Evidence, which lay obvious enough even for the Prejudiced to see it. But *Christ* would not refer his Disciples thither, because,

“ They were only Fishermen and not Scribes.”

Had they been *Scribes*, they would have wanted that Information, but been incapable of receiving it from the *Scriptures*, as the Author supposes the Disciples were.

“ From

“ From Observations on the Idioms and Genius
“ of the Hebrew Tongue, then antiquated *in a man-*
“ *ner and out of use :*”

Now quite antiquated and to be laid aside as of no use. The Christian that seriously weighs the Consequence of thus undermining the Foundation of our Faith, by representing the Sense and Meaning of the original Record, (which from the Nature of Evidence, and the one continued Direction of *Christ* and his Apostles, we must appeal to, and abide by) as depending upon the Meaning of the *Idioms and Genius of a Tongue antiquated in a manner, and out of use two thousand Years ago*, must think that the Author is laying a stumbling Block in the Way of the Ignorant and Unwary, and endeavouring to turn the Eyes of Mankind, from the chief and principal Evidence of their Faith, and consequently be greatly shocked at seeing such dangerous Positions advanced in a Writing which hath Dr. Sharp’s Name to it?

The Author continues to argue under the same fatal Mistake about the Certainty and Perspicuity of the *Hebrew* Scriptures, in the next Paragraph;

“ We are apt to conclude, and with great Reason, that he came not only to fulfil but to *explain* “ the Law, and the Prophets.”

This is *gratis dictum*; he came to *fulfil*; but not to *explain* what was writ so plain before, that it was able to make *Men wise unto Salvation*; and was as plain as the Holy Spirit and Spirit of Truth could make it. So plain that ignorant and *sceptical Jews* will be condemned for not believing *Moses*; and through *Moses* in *Christ*. We have had of late Years, even from our otherwise most eminent Writers, such strange Accounts of the Laws of God, and Religion of the *Jews*, their Ignorance, and the Obscurity of their Scriptures, and the inferior State of Religion, and Knowledge in their Days,

Days, and the Times before them, that Christianity has suffered more from its designed Friends, than all its bitterest Enemies put together. If our Lord came to *explain the Law*, and the *Prophets*, what is become of those Explanations? One would expect the Disciples should have preserved them for our use; instead of that, they only tell us in the gross, that they reasoned out of the Scriptures, and directed their ingenuous Hearers to search them daily to see whether those Things were so or no. *Christ* had nothing to do, nor the Disciples any thing to preach, *save what God had spoken by the Mouth of all his holy Prophets, since the World began.* As St. Paul says of himself, they witnessed both to small and great, saying none other Things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come. Not one Word do we ever read of any Obscurity in their Writings which wanted explaining.

But, says the Author,

" We know he (viz. *Christ*) did it in some Instances, in which the *Jews* had either ignorantly or perversely misinterpreted them."

This is not explaining the *Law* and the *Prophets*, but correcting the Ignorance and Perverseness of some Commentators upon them, which he did in some few Particulars; and is a quite different thing from *explaining the Prophets*, or making that plain, which they are supposed to have left obscure in antiquated *Idioms*, and so forth. *Christ* tells us the Scribes had made the Commandments of God of none effect by their Traditions; and that the next Generations should be seven times wickeder than their Fathers; and cautions us in the strongest manner, and on every Occasion, to beware of that cursed Leaven, a little of which leavens the whole Lump; which first puffs up the Heart, and then

fills

fills the Head with its Vapour, which after that is neither fit to direct nor be directed.

But supposing that the *Jews* did not then understand the Meaning of *Berith*, the Author puts the Question,

“ How happens it then, that we should hear of no Explanation from him of this important Sense of *Berith*, which the *Jews* had artfully concealed, and hid in their Versions—”

The Querist may find an Answer in p. 54. of the first of these learned *Dissertations*.

“ — Just as the apostate *Jews* are said to have done since his coming.”

I have no Quarrel with this Sentence; but take the Word *said* to be an Error of the Press for *proved*; because it is proved, *beyond all Contradiction*, that they have used their utmost Endeavours to mislead Christians, and have succeeded but too well, as it was foretold they would. This is almost the Case of *Abab*, when he was told beforehand, by one he acknowledged for a true Prophet, that there was a *lying Spirit* gone forth to deceive him, and that it would prevail also.

There is no doubt but that the Apostles who heard our Lord,

“ When he instituted the Sacrament, understood the Words he spoke, and the true Meaning of them,” p. 128.

Or, which is sufficient, did *soon after* do so;

“ And that St. *Mattbew* in reporting them in his *Gospel*, hath reported them faithfully.”

But a Writer in *Greek* could not use the same Words, if our Lord spoke in *Syriac* or *Hebrew*; and we must go back to the original Words, if we can find them: *Berith*, I believe, was one of these Words; and the *new Berith* may be translated *New Purification*, meaning the new Way of representing

the shedding of the Blood of *Christ*, which is our real Purification.

“ Now, (says the Doctor) how are we to understand the *old* and *new* Purifier.”

If *Purifier* be allowed to stand for the *Type*, the Sense is plain; it will be the *old* and *new* typical Purifier. But, I suppose, Wine cannot be called a *Purifier*, which is a *personal Name*, or Name of an *Agent*; therefore here we say, the *new Purification*. On which the Doctor remarks,

“ Or if it imported *Purification*, as Mr. H—n would have it, when he renders the Text thus, *This is my Blood of the New Purification*, will not his Blood of the Covenant go as easily down?”

p. 129.

Going easily down is too ludicrous an Expression to be applied to the Blood of *Christ*; the ingenious Author of the *Letter to a Bishop*, had said, *The Blood of the Covenant, is a Phrase that will hardly go down*, which keeps entirely clear of what is so offensive in the Expression above; and what that Author says, one would think should be true, because there is no Blood in a Covenant; a Covenant consists of Words only, unless you say, with Mr. H—n, that the Ceremonies in use, when the Prophets wrote at making a Covenant, were Part of it, and if they were, they were that Part to which the Blood belonged, for it belonged not to the Words, Articles, or Terms agreed upon.

“ In the mean time, (continues the Doctor) how shall we reconcile this *New Version* to the original Word *Διαθην*? ”

I hope that is done to the Satisfaction of the Reader, by shewing that *Διαθην* signifies *Institution*.

“ For though it be urged never so strongly, that it is only a *Version* of the original Word in St.

“ *Matthew’s* Gospel, yet it is properly the original
“ Word in *St. Paul.*”

No more than it is in *St. Matthew*. He relates the Words of *Christ* when he instituted the Sacrament, and *St. Paul* does the same. But *St. Paul*,

“ *He received his Account of the Institution there given from the Lord himself.*”

So did *St. Matthew*; and both might receive it in the same Language. But I see not what this Contest about its being an Original Word tends to. *Berith* is certainly an original Word, and the first used on the Occasion, and to which the other is allowed to refer; and if $\Deltaιαθην$ be an original Word too, then we have another original Word for the same thing. And if they do not directly coincide, it might become Men of Sense and Learning, to enquire wherein, and how far, they differ; and endeavour to obviate any ill Uses that might be made of such Difference; and perhaps their Time might be more usefully employed than in trying to shew, which is impossible, that the *Hebrew* and *Greek* have the same radical Idea or Meaning. It is common with Scripture, in different Descriptions of the same Thing, to use different Names or Words for it; and it is plain that different Names may be given to the same Person or Thing, and yet those Words shall not stand for the same Idea. And the Quarrel so warmly carried on against us for not submitting to construe *Berith* by $\Deltaιαθην$, I charge with a three-fold Error. In the first Place, for making it necessary that the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Names for the same Types, Persons or Things, should have the same radical Ideas. 2dly, In supposing it necessary that the *Hebrew* should bend to the *Greek*. And, 3dly, in construing $\Deltaιαθην$ by *Covenant*, and so losing that Sense of the Word, which seems to me to reconcile the Difference between the two Words in a Moment; for though

the Greek Word doth not signify *Purification*, yet it leads us to that Idea, almost whether we will or no; for,

“ The Idea of *Purification* goes always with *Blood* and *Blood-shedding* in the Expiatory Sacrifices under the Law,” p. 130,

And they are that *Institution* which this Word leads us to.

The Doctor gives it as his Judgment,

“ That there seems *more* Weight, Efficacy and Instruction in the Phrase; *Blood of the Covenant*, or *Blood of the New Testament*:

But *Covenant* and *Testament* are quite different things; and *Testament* falls in much easier with the general Sense of the Passage than *Covenant* does.

“ — Than there would have been in — The *Blood of Purification*, or the *Purification in his Blood*.”

The Judgment of Dr. Sharp hath great Weight with me, as no doubt it will have with others; and if the Matter did not rest on another Authority, I should not have presumed to have continued the Question about it. Reasons are to determine the Point; and the Doctor gives his. The first is what has been once or twice touched upon before, viz. that it is *superfluous* or more than necessary to call an *expiatory Sacrifice* by the name of *Purification*,

“ So that no Idea of Purification, that could possibly be conveyed by בְּרִית could be wanting in such Words as these; viz. το αἷμα πέρι πολλῶν, Especially when there is added εἰς αφεσιν αμαρτιῶν. Nor could the Idea be wanting, when our Lord calls it αἷμα μν.” p. 130.

This Argument from the Title of *Berith* (in our Sense of it,) being *too expressive* a Word, or the Idea of Purification being *too plain and strong* in

the expiatory Sacrifice to admit of so proper a Name being given it, I submit to the Reader's Arbitration without saying any thing more about it ; and pass on to the next Reason assigned in favour of *Covenant* against *Purification*, and it is this, that *Blood of the Covenant implies more than Purification in the Blood of Christ.*

“ But now *αἷμα διαθῆναι* implies more than all this. It denotes a *Covenant* founded on the shedding of this Blood ; in which Man hath a Part.”

Purification by the Blood of Christ expresses all that Man can hope or wish for, *the being made one with God in Christ* : Doth not lead us indeed to think that Man hath any Part in *making the Covenant founded on the shedding of this Blood* ; and consequently doth not lead him to think,

“ That he re-stipulates that Part every time he commemoates the *shedding of this Blood*.— Or that the Holy Communion is a repeated Ratification of Man's Part of the New *Covenant*, every time he partakes of it.

I confess, I know not what is meant by *Christ's being given to make a Covenant with the People*, and Man's repeatedly ratifying it on his Side ; we had offended God, and Christ is our Reconciliation ; as Ideas are borrowed from material Things, we are said to be unclean, and filthy in the Sight of God, and the Blood of Christ to purify that Uncleanness : and we are ordered to commemorate the shedding of this Blood for us, by pouring out of Wine in the Sacrament. The Holy Communion is a *Remembrance* of Christ, and exhibiting that Blood he shed for us to God, and claiming the Promise of Purification and Reconciliation by it. *Jesus Christ suffered Death upon the Cross for our Redemption, and made there (by his one Oblation of himself once offered) a full perfect and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation and Satisfaction*

satisfaction for the Sins of the whole World, and did institute, and in his Gospel command us to continue a perpetual Memory of that his precious Death till his Coming again. Some call this a Covenant, and renewing their Covenant with God, but it is talking in a loose and confused way, without clear and distinct Ideas of what they mean ; or else, it is having very incompetent and erroneous Notions of the Covenant of Grace, and their Part in it ; and I agree that this

“ Notion, had not been so much as suggested “ (at least not in the Form of the Institution) if “ our Lord had called it only the *Blood of Purifi-
cation*, shed for the Remission of Sins.”

And I hope the Notion will fall with rectifying the Construction of *Berith* and *Διαθήκη*; and help to put it out of People’s Heads that they can bargain with God for Salvation, or do any thing else towards it, but submit and accept the Mercies offered, *Remission of our Sins, and all other Benefits of his Passion.*

I pass on to p. 138. The Substance of what occurs between, having come several times into Dispute before. And here the Doctor seems to me to give up the whole Dispute at once.

“ But, it may be said, is not *to cut or cut off*, “ the proper and original Sense of *Carath* as a “ Root ? and was not the Application of it to “ Covenants entirely owing to the Use of the “ Word in Sacrifices, when they *cut off* Beasts, “ &c. on which Occasions Covenants were wont to “ be made, or ratified.” On which Occasions, must mean by which *Sacrifices*, Rites and Ceremonies, because they did not make the Covenant, because of the Sacrifice ; but offered up a Sacrifice when they had made a Covenant by way of Ratification of it ; publickly avowing it, and binding themselves in the strongest manner to observe it.

It is allowed then that the Application of *Carath* to *cut off* was owing to the Custom of *cutting off* at making a Covenant.

“ Suppose it was——?”

Then the Phrase was *once* proper, natural and grammatical.

“ — Yet it might become in Process of time, a mere customary Phrase——.”

But why might it? Learned Men, who are fond of shewing their Reading, may and often do, when they are writing in a *dead* Language, speak in Phrases borrowed from the Customs in Use with the People whose Language it was; and so though the Phrases are improper, they are understood to mean no more than the Phrases of their own Country expressed in a different way. But why are we to suppose that People would use Phrases for a thing that expressed something quite different from what they intended to say? As we cannot suppose that such Phrases would ever have come into use, had it not been for the Customs, which they so naturally express; so neither is there any Reason to suppose that they should ever be used, whilst those Customs were in common Use, but with respect to them; because it would have been a direct Falsehood for any one to have said, *I have cut off a Berith or a Juratorium*, when he had not done so, it being natural to understand People to mean by a Phrase what is commonly understood by it. The *Hebrews* and *Greeks* both made their Covenants and solemn Leagues by Sacrifices; and had some Rites peculiar to these *Sacrifices*, such as *cutting the Creature in Pieces*, &c. and therefore used proper Words to express it; and therefore to *cut Berith*, *ορθιον*, *σπονδας*, &c. were no improper Phrases for *making a Covenant*, provided such Rites or Ceremonies had intervened, because *cutting the Creature* was understood to bind as strongly as

Words could do ; and was in *Action*, what an Oath is in *Words*.

“ A mere customary Phrase, to express the
“ making or entering into a *Covenant* when no Sa-
“ crifices were offered, or even dreamed of : ”

They had no occasion to dream of a Sacrifice, when they stood over it ; *in fæderibus semper aliquid excidebatur* ; and it is but little better than Dreaming to talk so. The Phrases that were proper before Sacrifices ceased, might afterwards become mere *customary Phrases*, being preserved by those who affect Learning ; but to suppose them *mere customary Phrases* for something different from the natural Sense of the Words, whilst the Customs were in Use, merely to evade the Force of their obvious Meaning, (*as what may not be supposed when one has a mind to it, that is not impossible, yet it,)* amounts to no more than a groundless *Supposition*. Perhaps what follows was thought to amount to more.

“ Just as *ορκία τεμνεῖν* among the *Greeks*— Must
“ we therefore translate *ορκία τεμνεῖν* by *cutting* or
“ *cutting off Compacts upon Oaths* ? ”

No ! That is not a Translation of the Words. They called the Creatures they cut off upon these Occasions by the Name of *ορκία*. So that *ορκίον τεμνεῖν* is not to *take* or *give an Oath*, though the general design of the Author may to the *English* Ear be expressed in translating it so ; but it is to offer the *Oath-Sacrifice*. See the Quotations from *Homer* above. “ The Heralds brought through the
“ City the faithful *Juratoria* of the Gods, two Lambs,
“ v. 245.—the Heralds brought the faithful *Jurato-*
“ *ria of the Gods*,” v. 269.

*The Wine they mix ; and on each Monarch's Hands
Pour the full Urn ; then draws the Grecian Lord
His Cutlace sheath'd beside his pond'rous Sword ;*

From

From the sign'd Victims § crops * the curling Hair,
The Heralds part it, and the Princes share.

POPE, v. 339.

Then follow the Conditions of the League, and
the Invocation of Vengeance, or the Execration, and
this over,

αποτραχίς αρνω ταρει τηλει χαλκω. v. 292.

With that the Chief the tender Victims slew,
And in the Dust their bleeding Bodies tbrew. v. 364.

The Verb to *cut* used here, seems to be the Hebrew Word סַבַּח or סַבַּחַ to *finish*, to *consume*; variously Writ in Greek, τραω, ταμω, ταμνω, and τεμνω. I do not know how to think that this Gentleman could be unacquainted with the Propriety of Greek Phrases, and not know that the Creatures they sacrificed on these Occasions were called ορκια. And therefore the Phrase was proper in *Greek*, and only wants to be made *English*, which *cutting off a Compact upon Oath*, the Gentleman himself could not but know, doth not make it; it is not a true Translation of the Words. And if any less correct Writers did in Process of Time use the Phrase to express *making a Covenant when no Sacrifices were offered or even dreamed of*, all that I can say is, they might be dreaming of something else; for they were asleep when they talked so idly. I would be understood here to except the Learned, who use old Phrases, however improper the Change of Customs have made them, out of respect to Antiquity; but during the Times of the Prophets there was no such Change of Customs, and if towards the

Decline

§ *Greek*, From the Heads of the Lambs. * *Greek*, Cut.

Decline of the antient *Grecian* or *Roman* Customs and Learning, Writers wrote in a more loose and unguarded way, and used Phrases that were *Falsehoods*, because once true, why must the inspired Writers be supposed to do so too? They could not be led into it by Ignorance, Affectation, or want of proper Words.

And when was it that בְּרִית and *berith* became mere *customary Phrases*, being *antiquated* and worn out of their original Propriety? I put this Question because the Doctor will not allow them to bear their original Sense, even where they are used betwixt God and *Noah*; and (not long after) betwixt God and *Abraham*, which was so early, that they had scarce had time enough to be *antiquated*; unless they were almost worn out when *Noah* brought them cross the Flood; though if *Hebrew* were a *Plank of the Shipwreck at Babel*, that could not be the Case, nor could *Hebrew Idioms* get out of use so soon, (one would think) as the Time of *Moses*; and then it must be allowed that we have construed them right whereever they occur in the *Pentateuch*. How far further we may reasonably extend the *natural Life* of these Phrases, before they began their *metaphorical Life*, I shall leave to the *Reader* to determine. And I beg leave to refer to a *Letter to a Bishop*, p. 60 — 62. for the Meaning of the *Latin Phrases* here paralleled with the *Hebrew* and *Greek* ones,

And proceed to the next thing contended for, which is the over-ruling the Sense of *Carath* by the Noun it is joined with.

“ So neither should we render בְּרִית by any other Verb then what is proper to accompany the Noun “ that it governs in Composition.”

Let us invert this Argument. “ Neither should we render *Berith* by any other *Noun* then what is proper to accompany the *Verb* that governs it in Composition,” I imagine the Reasoning is as strong

strong on one side, as the other. And then we must look out for some Noun for *Berith* that is proper to accompany the Verb; or suppose it to signify something that could be cut off; and the Reasoning will be a little helped here, by considering that there is some Probability that *Berith* was a Name for a Creature that could be slain; but it is not pretended that *cutting off* is not the genuine Sense of *Carath*, and, *strictly speaking, the only proper Sense*. See p. 139.

“ To which I answer, (says the Doctor) it will be with כְּרָתָה when joined to בְּרִית just as it is with טְמֵנָה when used with אָמֵן—the true Meaning of the several Verbs in all the other Uses of them, is not lost or impaired by this Application of them to *Covenants*—.”

But the Question is, why it should be lost or impaired in this Application of them to *Covenants*? Or why the Antients should use such Verbs as will not bear to be understood in their *proper Sense*? That Sense not being lost in other Uses of them, is no Reason why it should be lost here, but the Reverse.

“ — Neither is their true and proper Meaning retained in this Application; at least it is only so far retained, as may serve to point out the Origin of such Application.”

That is all we contend for; and what the Doctor has been arguing against for some Pages; for understanding them in the Sense of *making* doth not retain the *Origin of such Application*. But what is meant by *their true and proper Meaning not being retained in this Application of them to Covenants*, and yet being *so far retained as may serve to point out the Origin of such Application*? Is there a middle Way betwixt *being retained* and *not retained*? I think it is always allowed that when a *Man of Sense* is driven

driven to argue in the *less consistent* way, he is confuted, whether he will acknowledge it or no. And I pitch upon the last Paragraph of the Doctor's as a Specimen of that kind of Reasoning.—“ The true and proper Meaning of these Verbs is not retained, at least it is only so far retained as to point out their proper Meaning.”

Nor can the Objection, which the Doctor hath ingenuously put in its full Strength, be evaded but by saying something that will not hang together. If the Words were proper according to their natural or radical Sense, why do we not translate them according to that Sense? If they were not proper, why did the Antients use them? Or are we better Judges than they what Words it was proper for them to use? Had the learned Gentleman been pleased to have put it out of all doubt by proper Authorities or Instances that *ορχιον τεμνειν* was never more than a *mere customary Phrase*, it would have added some Weight to his Inference. There are indeed some small Improprieties in most Languages, and some in our own; but I hope there are no such gross ones in *Hebrew*, used however, by the Prophets; nor any of that kind, used in the *Greek Testament*, by those who were directed by him to speak, who made the Mouth, and (the *Hebrew* the first) Language himself. What Reasons *Etymologists* may furnish us with that favour the Doctor's Cause, I cannot tell; nor has he been pleased to tell us himself; he only says,

“ If you ask the Reason of all this” (viz. the Impropriety of the Phrases in *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin* we are contending about) “ the Etymologists will tell you.”

But I wish the Doctor had been pleased to have told us himself; for I confess I am at a Loss where to go for it. But it seems,

“ It

“ It cannot well be otherwise, unless we were
 “ wholly to drop all metaphorical or figurative Use
 “ of Words, with which no Language abounds
 “ more than the Hebrew.”

Though it is the only Language perhaps that cannot abound in *verbal Metaphors*, because it is *ideal*; or its Words are applied to the *Ideas* of Things. The Phrases in dispute arose from Customs once in use, and continued as long as those Customs did, as common Phrases. And when those Customs and Languages were no more in common use, or were greatly altered, the Phrases were preserved by the Learned. Or perhaps even before the Languages became dead, and the Customs were entirely disused, which they were designed at first to express, they might possibly be used in a more lax Manner, yet that will not take away the native Use of the Words, or justify the Critick in understanding them always in *the secondary Sense*, which the Design of the sacred Rite, they describe, brings to the Mind at the same Time. How far such an incorrect way of speaking may be justified by Authorities from profane Authors, the Doctor is certainly a much better Judge than I am. How far he has justified it by Authorities from the sacred Writers, we must leave to the Reader to judge of from a Survey of what is laid before him on both Sides.

The Reader may observe, that the Doctor, p. 137—140. argues entirely upon a Supposition that *Berith* and *ορθιον* signify only Covenant and Oath, which may not be so indisputable a Point, as was apprehended; and thence he would have the Application of *Carath* and *τεμνων* to their respective Nouns, to be metaphorical and figurative; but what the Figure is they carry, or whence the Metaphor is taken, is not made altogether so clear as it should

should have been. If you say it is the Figure of the Sacrifice which they carry, then they are not metaphorical, but descriptive Words; which spoils the whole Inference. And understanding them to signify a Covenant made, is only taking for granted, what is necessarily implied. For they offered the *Covenant-Sacrifice*, and the *Oath-Offering*, to confirm the Covenant or Oath. And it is the close Connection betwixt the Sacrifices, and the Design for which they offered them, so clearly expressed in the Titles they gave these Sacrifices, that has given the Doctor the whole Pretence he has to dispute, all the Room he hath of contesting, with us the true Sense of those Phrases. It is from a metaphorical Use of these Words this learned Gentleman would have it, that

“ These Verbs, we are speaking of, became
“ mere Idioms, or peculiar Phrases of these Lan-
“ guages, carrying only *one* Sense.—”

Such Phrases were not Idioms of any one, but common, as far as we know to the contrary, to all the Languages in the World, where Sacrifices were used, and continued so, till Sacrifices were disused; which seems to lay the Foundation of them, not in *Figure* and *Metaphor*, but in Propriety and Truth.

“ Nor, says he, is the original Source or Root, from whence these Words are derived, any further to be regarded in these Idioms, or customary Phrases, than for the Satisfaction of the Curious and Inquisitive, who love to discover the *Ground* and *Reason* of every Expression in Language.” p. 140.

And that seems to be what Mr. H——n aimed at in his Enquiry into the *Ground* and *Reason* of the *Hebrew* Phrase; the frequent Use of which, and the important Occasions it is used upon, the great

great Object (on which our Faith and Hopes of Salvation depend) it is applied to, and the Infallibility of those Men, in whose Mouths we so often find it ; all these Considerations call for the most careful, nice, and critical Enquiry into the exact and precise Meaning of it ; not to satisfy an inquisitive Temper, or indulge an idle Curiosity, but to remove all Scruples, Diffidence and Confusion from Words that concern the Fundamental Article of our Faith ; nay, on which depend (inclusively) all the Articles of the Creed.

“ And when the Discovery is made, (says the Doctor) it amounts to no more than a critical Observation, or a grammatical Speculation. And if no more than this be intended in what is urged concerning *Carath* and *Berith*, and their Force and Signification in the *Hebrew Scripture*, *there is no Objection to be made against it.*

I think this is a full Concession that Mr. H——n hath discovered the *Ground and Reason of the Expression*. And that his *critical Observation*, and *grammatical Speculation* on these Words are right ; and if by that Means he has struck out any Light, it is to be hoped that they who will, may have liberty to, take the Advantage of it.

The Pleasure this Concession gives, is somewhat abated by what follows, and concludes the Dissertations,

“ But if it be propounded, and so it seems to be, as a *new and most important Discovery*, without which, &c.—I cannot dissemble my Dissent to it, after the most accurate and impartial Enquiry I have hitherto been able to make into it.”

On which I shall only observe, that as this learned Adversary of Mr. H——n’s set out with telling his Readers, it was not the *Errors* so much, as *want*

of *Deference* in that great Man, and those who follow him, that induced him to set Pen to Paper; so it is not now the Falsity of the *critical Observation* or *grammatical Speculation* on the Phrase we have been canvassing, but the *great Importance* pretended to be in the Discovery, which will not let him *dissimile his Dissent to it*; and this will abate somewhat, I hope, of the Prejudice, which the Disapprobation of so eminent a Judge in the learned Languages must have raised against Mr. H——n's Criticisms upon them.

F I N I S.

